

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for me to make a motion to take up a measure?

Mr. McNARY. No; I can not do that to-night. It probably will lead to quite extended debate. I have promised to move a recess at 5.30, and I shall have to adhere to my promise.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield while I make an announcement then?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that to-morrow, if I can obtain the floor, I shall move to proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 202 was passed.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McNARY. I yield for a notice, not for a motion.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I regret that I shall have to ask for a continuation of the consideration of Senate bill 3344 when the Senate meets to-morrow, if I have no opportunity this evening.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 31, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the joy of loving hearts, we turn again to Thee, for we recall the heights, the raptures, and the deathless passion of Him who is the Saviour of men. The coldest heart warms at the remembrance of the word, "He had compassion upon them." In Thee we find a relief in sorrow, rest in weariness, comfort in bereavement, and an inspiration when our strength runs low. O put Thy touch upon our old, destructive weaknesses and convert them into forces that shall build up, purify, renew, and enrich our lives as they have never been before. May we rededicate ourselves to humanity and the free-born institutions of our country, and with a ready courage fling away any flimsy fetters from our emancipated souls. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to a bill of the following title:

S. 3938. An act authorizing the construction of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, an appropriation therefor, and the completion of the project, and for other purposes.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by Hon. Henry T. Fletcher, chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, over the radio on January 26 last.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRY P. FLETCHER, CHAIRMAN UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The Tariff Commission is composed of three Republicans and three Democrats. While it is bipartisan in make-up, its findings and reports will be nonpartisan in character.

Before describing our work I wish to tell you something of the members of the commission. The President has designated me as chairman and Mr. Thomas W. Page as vice chairman.

Mr. Page was educated at Randolph Macon, Universities of Virginia, Leipzig, Oxford, and Paris. He has taught economics at the Universities of California and Virginia. He was a member and chairman of the Tariff Commission from 1918 to 1922. Mr. Page is recognized as one of the foremost economists of the United States.

The third member is Mr. John Lee Coulter, a product of the great Northwest. He was schooled at Minnesota, North Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, and has a Ph. D. from Wisconsin and an LL. D. from North Dakota. He is an able economist and statistician. After eight years as president of North Dakota State College he became, in 1929, chief economist of the Tariff Commission and was appointed a commissioner on the reorganization of the commission.

The fourth member is Mr. Alfred P. Dennis, of Maryland, a graduate of Princeton. He has taught at Princeton, Wesleyan, and Smith. He has been commercial attaché at Rome and London. He served in the Department of Commerce under Mr. Hoover, and on the former Tariff Commission for six years and was vice chairman of it.

The fifth member is Mr. Edgar B. Brossard, born and raised in Idaho. He attended Utah State College, Cornell, and the University of Minnesota. He has devoted himself especially to the study of agricultural economics. He was appointed an economist on the staff of the commission in 1923 and became a commissioner in 1925, and was serving as chairman when the commission was reorganized last September.

The sixth member is Mr. Lincoln Dixon, of Indiana. He is a graduate of Indiana State University and a lawyer. He was a Member of Congress for 14 years and served on the Ways and Means Committee of the House for 8 years. He also was a member of the former Tariff Commission.

The first Tariff Commission, properly so called, was established in 1916. Its duties were confined to gathering information for the use of Congress in making the tariff laws. By 1922 public opinion demanded that the Tariff Commission be given broader powers, powers to investigate and report upon the rates fixed by Congress. This was granted in the act of 1922. The Tariff Commission by that act was charged with the duty of making, on appropriate occasion, studies of the differences in the costs of production at home and abroad of commodities affected by the tariff and of reporting the results to the President.

In other words, the preceding commission was merely a fact-finding body, and the President was authorized to proclaim increases or decreases in the existing rates of duty as indicated by the facts developed in the investigations. It was for him to decide whether any change should be made and how much the rate fixed in the tariff act should be increased or decreased—always within 50 per cent.

The act of 1930 has broadened still further the powers of the Tariff Commission. In addition to costs of production, transportation, and other costs incident to delivery, the commission is authorized to consider other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition. Furthermore, the commission now specifies in its reports to the President the necessary increase or decrease in the rate. For instance, if the rate of duty on a certain article is 10 cents, we can specify an increase to 15 cents or a decrease to 5 cents.

It sounds simple, but it is not so simple as it sounds.

We must ascertain the difference in foreign and domestic costs of production and delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States of the commodity or article which is the subject of our investigation. We must select a representative year or number of years, which will be fair to all concerned, to be used in making our comparison of costs. We send our technical experts and trained accountants to the principal factories in the United States. They make a detailed and thorough examination of their accounts. We get their costs of producing the particular article and transporting it to the principal market or markets of the United States. This is one side of the equation.

Now, how do we find out how much it costs to produce and market the foreign article? Under the law we must first determine which is the principal competing foreign country. This we do by an examination of the import statistics and related data. Foreigners did not and do not always relish the idea of having agents and representatives of the United States Tariff Commission inquiring into their costs of production, and this fact made foreign cost inquiries by the former commission very difficult and often impossible. So Congress in the new act gave us authority, if we find foreign costs in the principal competing country not readily ascertainable, to accept as evidence thereof, or as supplemental thereto, the weighted average of the invoice prices or values of the article and/or the average wholesale selling price for a representative period of time. The transportation and other costs incident to delivery at the principal market or markets of our country are ascertained just as is the case in regard to the domestic article.

We then weigh, if there are any, other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition as between the domestic and foreign article or commodity.

We must then report to the President the specific change in the rate of duty necessary to equalize the difference in costs as between the domestic and foreign article. If, in his judgment, our findings are correct, he issues a proclamation approving the rate specified by us and the new rates go into effect 30 days thereafter.

The President must accept or reject our findings. He can not modify them.

The law requires us to hold a public hearing in the course of each investigation looking toward a change in the rate of duty. Reasonable notice is given of this hearing—usually about 30 days—and all parties interested are given an opportunity to be heard and produce evidence.

Now, then, how are these rate-change cases brought before our commission? They come to us in many ways. The President or the Senate or the House may request us to make these investigations. Or we can order them upon our own motion, or any citizen or firm or corporation may apply to us to investigate rates which are considered too high or too low.

The new commission took office on September 17 last. We found that the Senate almost immediately after the passage of the last tariff bill had requested us to make investigations of rates which had just been fixed by the Congress itself. A great deal of preliminary work in these investigations had been made by the staff under the direction of the former commission. It might be said here that the new commission made no changes in the technical staff of the commission as it existed when we took office except to fill vacancies.

Since we took office in September we have held hearings and made exhaustive cost studies in 18 rate-change cases, and reports on most of them are almost ready for submission to the President. In some we shall find that the rate should be left as fixed by the Congress; in others we shall recommend decreases and in others increases, depending solely and absolutely on the facts as developed in the investigation in each particular case.

We have pending investigations requested by the Senate on such important items as boots and shoes, hides and skins, cement, lumber and timber, laces, and agricultural hand tools.

The new commission has changed very materially the practice followed by its predecessors. We have speeded up our work and brought it under more direct control and supervision of the commission itself.

As soon as an application or request is received, the chairman appoints one or more members of the commission as a subcommittee to supervise every step and detail of the investigation. In consultation with the staff a detailed plan is drawn up and submitted to the whole commission. This plan is considered, amended if necessary, and approved. If an investigation is ordered, the work goes forward on the line proposed. The subcommittee is in constant touch with it. If difficulties or problems appear, they are brought before the full commission for solution.

When the investigation is concluded the subcommittee, with the assistance of our experts, of course, draws up the draft report to the President and submits it to the full commission. We go over it in detail, and if and when approved, it is submitted through the chairman to the President. I should say in passing that the Tariff Commission can not under the law change an article from the free list to the dutiable list, or vice versa.

So far we have received 68 applications from private sources and 44 investigations have been ordered, 41 of them by Senate resolution.

So far I have spoken principally of our powers and duties in investigations looking toward a change in the tariff rates.

The commission has under the law other important duties to which I can only briefly refer in the time at my disposal this evening.

It is the Government's reservoir of information relating to the tariff in this and other countries. This information has been acquired and is kept up to date by constant research and study on the part of our staff.

When a tariff bill is before the Congress the commission becomes practically a bureau of information for both Houses.

In addition to this general and continuing work the 1930 act imposes several particular tasks upon us.

We are required to make a report to Congress by July 1, 1932, on the conversion of tariff rates from the foreign to the domestic value basis. Under the present tariff act, ad valorem duties are assessed on foreign selling prices. The commission is now called upon to find out what the corresponding rates of duty would have been if based on the selling price of the imported articles in the United States. The period on which the calculation is to be based is July, 1927, to June 30, 1929. This means that the commission must go over all of the importations during those two years, determine the duty collected, the foreign selling price, and the domestic selling price for each article or group of articles, and compute an equivalent duty.

The act also directs us to ascertain and report to Congress by the 15th of next month the approximate average cost per barrel to the oil refineries located on our Atlantic seaboard of crude petroleum delivered to them from the oil fields of the United States and from Lake Maracaibo, Venezuela. This report has required a tremendous amount of high-pressure work. We have had the full and hearty cooperation of the oil industry both here and in Venezuela, and our report will be ready within the time fixed by the law.

We have also been requested by Congress to make a special study of vegetable and whale oils.

Then, too, we are conducting for the use of Congress an extensive investigation of the fishing industry of the United States. In the course of this investigation we have sent out over 50,000 schedules to fishermen in the United States and its possessions, and have already spent over \$21,000 in gathering the informa-

tion desired. We hope to complete this report in the course of the next two months.

Furthermore, if the Tariff Commission finds upon investigation that foreign firms engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair trade practices the effect or tendency of which is to destroy or substantially injure a home industry, efficiently and economically operated, or prevent the establishment of such an industry here, or to restrain or monopolize trade and commerce in the United States, it so reports to the President and he can exclude the articles concerned from entry into the United States.

Also, if we ascertain that any foreign country discriminates directly or indirectly against the commerce of the United States and so report to the President, he can proclaim additional duties on the articles imported from that country, and if after proclamation of this kind the foreign country continues to discriminate against our trade, the President is empowered to proclaim a total exclusion of its imports.

The rate-changing powers of the Tariff Commission are naturally the most important. Many people in this country think the rates in the Hawley-Smoot Act are too high or too low. Most people in foreign countries are sure they are too high. The Tariff Commission as at present organized is prepared and willing, if given sufficient staff and facilities, to decide each particular case, within the limitations of the law, on its merits.

It may not be possible to take the tariff out of politics. Time will tell. The commission is ready to do its part.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun on the treatment now being accorded Gen. Smedley Butler by the State and Navy Departments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the editorial.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called up a privileged resolution with reference to calling the Veterans' Committee together. I rise to say that I do not intend to press that resolution at this time for the reason that we have already got results and the committee has been called together.

RESTRICTING IMMIGRATION FOR TWO YEARS

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have two legislative days in which to file minority views on House Joint Resolution 473, further restricting for a period of two years immigration into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that he may have two legislative days in which to file minority views on House Joint Resolution 473. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIMMONS, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 16738, Rept. No. 2427) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and with the accompanying report referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves all points of order.

GEN. J. WARREN KEIFER

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I ask unanimous consent for the Speaker to convey to the Hon. J. Warren Keifer, of Springfield, Ohio, a former Member, and one of the two surviving Speakers, of this House, the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on this his ninety-fifth birthday. [Applause.] Also, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

General Keifer was born near Springfield, Ohio, 95 years ago, and there he lives to-day in the sunset of life, the ad-

miration of his neighbors and the inspiration of every youth with noble American impulses. He served 14 years in Congress, and was Speaker of this House in the Forty-seventh Congress, 1881-1883.

His political party lacked a majority of the Members, party feeling ran high; and yet, though many of his decisions were appealed from, such was his fairness and such the esteem in which he was held, that the House never failed to sustain him.

He made his way, like so many of our great men, from the humble walks of life and worked and earned his education. At the outbreak of the war for the preservation of the Union he answered Lincoln's call and enlisted as a private. Because of his fine ability, his zeal, earnestness, courage, and loyalty he was advanced from grade to grade until, after being made a brigadier general on October 19, 1864, "for gallant and meritorious service in the Battles of Opequon, Fishers Hill, and Middletown, Va.," he was made a major general of Volunteers on April 9, 1865, having been wounded four times in battle. I recommend to you all his historic work, *Slavery and Four Years of War*, published in 1900.

When the war with Spain broke out, General Keifer, advanced in years, was again commissioned a major general of Volunteers, and in a united country served as a comrade with Gen. Joe Wheeler and Gen. Fitzhugh Lee and other splendid officers who had commanded in the Confederate Army in the fratricidal struggle of 1861-1865.

To this model American, head and beard snowy with the years, still living with "honor, love, obedience, troops of friends," an inspiration to the young and old, I ask this House of Representatives to send its greetings, its felicitations, and its love. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD]. It has been my privilege to know General Keifer for years. He has honored me with his friendship, and I take especial pleasure in seconding this request because of the fact that when General Keifer was receiving his promotion as a gallant soldier in the Union Army he was fighting the battles of the Union about the old town of Winchester, Va., and was stationed there for some time during those fights, and he so conducted himself toward the people of Winchester in those trying times as to endear himself to the citizenship and people of the town that, after the Civil War closed, they sent him a special invitation to Washington to come back to Winchester that they might show their appreciation of his great services to them during those dreadful times. He went and was received with the warmth of hospitality so peculiar to those noble people. I esteem it a great privilege to be permitted to second this request of the gentleman from Ohio. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire the indulgence of the House for two minutes to also second the request of the gentleman from Ohio, supported by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Not only did General Keifer leave a wonderful legislative record in the halls of Congress but he has left a fine posterity. I not only know him personally but also three generations following him. Twenty years after Gen. J. Warren Keifer was Speaker of this House, J. Warren Keifer, II, was an able speaker of the House of Representatives of Nebraska. His son, Oswin Keifer, is one of the distinguished citizens of our State, active in public affairs. The oncoming generation following him, including J. Warren Keifer, III, leaves alive to-day perhaps the most impressive family in America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD], seconded by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent that the Speaker be directed to send an expression of felicitation to Gen. J. Warren Keifer, former Speaker of the House, on the occasion of his ninety-fifth birthday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the

Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Baird | Douglas, Ariz. | Igoe | Rich |
| Barbour | Douglass, Mass. | Jenkins | Rowbottom |
| Beck | Doyle | Johnson, Wash. | Sabath |
| Black | Drane | Kearns | Short |
| Boylan | Dunbar | Knutson | Simms |
| Britten | Esterly | Kunz | Sirovich |
| Brunner | Evans, Calif. | Lea, Calif. | Sproul, Ill. |
| Buckbee | Fenn | Leech | Sullivan, N. Y. |
| Carley | Fitzpatrick | McFadden | Tarver |
| Celler | Garrett | McMillan | Thompson |
| Chase | Gasque | Michaelson | Turpin |
| Clark, Md. | Golder | Neldringhaus | Williams, Tex. |
| Corning | Hardy | Oliver, N. Y. | Yates |
| Cullen | Haugen | Palmisano | Zihlman |
| Dempsey | Hoffman | Pou | |
| Dickstein | Hudspeth | Reid, Ill. | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-one Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under agreement entered into last evening, the Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 144.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 129, after line 15, insert: "There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS. Yesterday in the discussion of the agreement, which was finally reached, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] made this statement, if the Chair will permit me to read it, which appears at page 3548 of the RECORD:

The offering of amendments; yes. My suggestion would be that it would be helpful to the House if gentlemen who desire to offer amendments might have them read at beginning of debate, for the information of the House, so that we would know what we are talking about. That would not come out of the time, necessarily. They could just be offered for the information of the House.

My inquiry is whether or not the Chair will permit those amendments to be offered now. There are two or three, at least, which have been prepared, and under the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], would the Chair recognize Members to offer those amendments before debate actually begins?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that under the agreement, the time being equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], no amendments could be offered without either one of them yielding for that purpose, but the Chair is of the opinion that any time they do yield an amendment can be offered and regarded as pending.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. There was discussion from point to point.

Finally, on page 3549 of the RECORD, there was some discussion in line with what the Speaker has just stated. The final word on the subject in the discussion was:

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, under this procedure, how will a Member of the House who is not yielded time, be permitted to offer amendments to this one amendment?

The SPEAKER. He would not be permitted to offer amendments. Mr. SIMMONS. I think it ought to be understood, then, that the proposition of offering amendments will be entirely in the

control of those to whom either the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] or the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] yields time.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is quite an ordinary situation, and is always so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. My object was only to save as much time for debate as possible.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House disagree to Senate amendment 144.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] moves that the House disagree to Senate amendment 144.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. To offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] offers a motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 144 with the following amendment: Page 129, line 18, after the word "by," strike out "the American National Red Cross" and insert "and under the direction of the President of the United States."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order upon the amendment.

In connection with that, permit me to say that under the precedents, the amendment seems to me to be not germane and, hence, subject to a point of order, because Senate amendment 144 proposes to meet a certain emergency through a certain agency, the National Red Cross. The amendment just suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] proposes to meet that same emergency through a different agency—namely, any Government agency selected by the President. Therefore, under the precedents of decisions by Chairman SANDERS, followed by Chairman MAPES, and later by Chairman STAFFORD, which decisions are uniform, that where an original provision is for the use of one agency an amendment proposing a different agency would not be in order, this amendment is not in order. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to resort to technicalities, and, knowing that this amendment is offered in perfect good faith by my colleague [Mr. TAYLOR] and represents his views and believing it is best that the real attitude of the House be ascertained, I will not make the point of order. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the reservation ought to be decided.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation, and I was about to state that when the gentleman interrupted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would a motion to concur have preference over a motion to concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. At this stage of the proceedings the Chair thinks that a motion to concur with an amendment would have preference over a motion to concur.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that this amendment is not as yet in disagreement. It is only after an amendment has been in disagreement that a motion to concur with an amendment takes precedence over a motion to concur.

The SPEAKER. At this stage of the proceedings the Chair thinks a motion to concur with an amendment has precedence over a motion to concur. In support of that opinion the Chair has at hand several precedents which may be found in Hinds' Precedents, Volume V, sections 6169-6171.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for one hour.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. It is a serious condition that confronts the House. This conflict between the Senate and the House over this relief item is exceedingly unfortunate for the American people, and for the Congress, and especially for the millions of people who are desperately in need of

food. Recrimination and partisanship will not help any and will do no good. We ought to submerge feelings of that kind and see if we can not come to some sane, patriotic, and sensible way out of the present situation.

I think it is most unfortunate that the Red Cross was brought into this amendment. The Red Cross for many years has been the guardian angel of the distressed peoples of this whole planet. We all honor it. Nobody should want to ever do anything that would in any way destroy the usefulness, diminish the high standing which that organization occupies. No organization in our country or in the world has ever had a higher standing, nobler career, than the American National Red Cross. It should never be dragged into politics or commercialized in any way. It should always represent the highest ideals of public charity and good will. For that reason I am trying, in my motion, to eliminate that organization from consideration in this Senate amendment No. 44. It seems to me every patriotic citizen of our Republic ought to be willing to trust the President of the United States to administer this great \$25,000,000 relief fund.

We should be willing to place it in his hands, to be used in his discretion and under his direction for the relief of distress of every kind and everywhere and anywhere throughout our country. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I earnestly say to you now that I firmly believe Congress will very soon be forced to come to the position provided for in my amendment and place our relief funds absolutely and unconditionally at the disposal of the President, to be used as he may direct, and instead of this \$25,000,000 we will be appropriating \$100,000,000 for this purpose.

The country wants relief now. It does not want quarreling between or haggling over legislative procedure. If the House adopts my motion it will quickly settle the controversy, and this money will be almost immediately available for the relief of suffering humanity. It is time for this House to promptly decide upon a course that will get beneficial results. I assume we all want to work for the welfare of the people who are in a semistarving condition, hundreds and thousands of them, to-day. If you adopt the motion of the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague on this Interior Department subcommittee, and send this provision to conference and instruct your conferees to object to it and stand pat against the United States Senate, what will be the result? A deadlock, that may last for weeks. In the meantime what is becoming of the people who must immediately have this relief which we all want them to have? I do earnestly feel that my amendment is an honorable, sensible, practicable, and fair solution of this matter. By this action we will not be in the attitude of superseding or in any way interfering with the splendid work of the American Red Cross. At the same time we will put this great fund at the disposal of the President, where it can be used wherever and however needed. He can apportion it to various relief organizations. If the American Red Cross ever needs any of it he can help them. He can give some of it to the Salvation Army, to the American Legion, and to hundreds of other associations that may be able to wisely and humanely use it as he may see fit. I do not see how we could place it in better hands.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I suggest to the gentleman that the designation of the President is in accordance with a good many precedents. For instance, when the war began there were appropriations made and complete discretion vested in the President of the United States with reference to their expenditure, once an appropriation of \$100,000,000 and, I think, again, an appropriation of \$20,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; I thank the gentleman from Virginia for the suggestion; we have innumerable precedents for this action.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And another precedent is a very large lump-sum appropriation that was put under the direction of Mr. Hoover as Food Administrator for expenditure in Europe.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes. I might say that during the great crisis of the World War, on each side of this Chamber we went down the line shoulder to shoulder for the welfare of our country; we stood behind the President of the United States and trusted him implicitly, and I feel we ought to do the same thing with President Hoover in this great emergency.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder whether the gentleman has considered the matter of turning this money over to the American Legion?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; I have considered that and many other possible ways of having this money handled.

Mr. RANKIN. Turn it over to the American Legion and they will take it and do the work.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think the American Legion has a sufficiently equipped organization throughout the country to promptly handle this work.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; it has.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I feel that would set a wrong precedent. I am not in favor of giving all this money to any organization. I feel the President of the United States is the only proper one to apportion and properly handle this great fund.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's motion, but I am wondering whether the President would exercise the authority if you give it to him, in view of his attitude that he does not think the Government ought to do anything at all.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. President Hoover will never deny the appeals of the starving people of this country no matter where those appeals come from. He is the president of the American National Red Cross, and his heart beats for all the American people. He will honestly, intelligently, and promptly administer this great fund for the welfare of all suffering Americans and in a way that will be a credit to his great office and an honor to our country.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The President could not refuse to administer it, especially when under the act of February 25, 1919, this Congress turned over to the President \$100,000,000, which Mr. Hoover himself spent in feeding the starving people of Europe. He certainly could not refuse to do the same thing for the people of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I can not see how Congress or either the Senate or House can justify their actions in voting against placing this responsibility in the hands of the President of the United States to use as his judgment shall dictate.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield for a short question only.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does the gentleman interpret his amendment to mean that the President could allot this money to the Red Cross or to the Salvation Army?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes; of course; to the Red Cross or the Salvation Army, or all other humanitarian associations, committees, or to whomever he pleased, just as the judgment of the President in the matter should dictate.

The adoption of my amendment will prevent any action of ours from injuring or affecting the present \$10,000,000 drive of the Red Cross or being detrimental to that organization at all, and I feel that we should take this action now, instead of sending this Senate amendment to conference. My friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and I will both be on that conference and we will, of course, try to carry out the instructions of this House, but let me say to you, that while we are trying to carry out the instructions of the House we will be opposite five gentlemen from the Senate on the other side of the table who will be under

positive instructions given them at least several times by a vote of three to one for them to stand by the Senate amendment. Do you want to have us stand in a deadlock for weeks? Do you want to force an extra session of Congress? Do you want to indefinitely deny these people the relief they are so desperately in need of, immediately?

Let us forget politics. Let us forget the intemperate language that has been used elsewhere. Let us forget parliamentary tactics. Let us forget personalities. Let us relieve suffering Americans now. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Colorado desire to yield further for presentation of any other amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to present an amendment, and I also yield the gentleman 10 minutes time.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I ask to be read for the information of the House and to be regarded as pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment for the information of the House and asks that it be regarded as pending. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS moves to concur in the Senate amendment No. 144, with the following amendment: After the words "Red Cross," in line 19, page 129, insert the following: "Or through such agency as it may select," and strike out the period at the end of line 22, on page 129, insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That if the American National Red Cross shall decline to distribute the money herein appropriated through its regularly organized agencies in the manner herein provided, then in such event the President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to immediately designate some governmental agency or other agency selected by him to make distribution of all or any portion of said sum in cash or in the purchase of said named supplies as may be necessary to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure same."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, my time is so very limited that I want to ask the indulgence of Members that I be not interrupted until I can at least make a statement with regard to this amendment and some of my views relative to this appropriation.

You will observe that the motion which I have offered and which will be considered and voted upon in the event the House does not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, meets the objection of Judge Payne which was urged in his hearing, to the effect that the Red Cross was not provided with sufficient organization in the cities to enable the Red Cross to properly distribute the fund which it is proposed to place in its hands. It was my suggestion to him that he might use some of these great organizations, like the Community Chest, the Salvation Army, the American Legion, organizations of the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant churches, or of the Masons, Elks, and other fraternal organizations.

If this amendment is adopted the Red Cross will be permitted to use all or any of these organizations for the purpose of making distribution in the cities. In my opinion there is no organization in the country so well fitted to administer a great fund of this kind for the particular purposes for which some of us wish it appropriated than the great American Red Cross with its chapters located throughout the country. I do not believe if this Congress should make this appropriation, with the amendment to which I have referred, that the Red Cross will decline to distribute it. I believe that this great organization, established for the purpose of relieving the suffering and the distressed throughout the land, and to which millions of people contribute for the purpose of enabling it to carry out its purposes, will accept \$25,000,000, even though the Government of the United States be the donor, and will distribute it to relieve suffering and starvation throughout the country in a manner whereby it will do the greatest good. Therefore, I have proposed this amendment with the view of permitting the Red Cross, first, to have the opportunity to make the distribution, but in the event it declines, then to enable the

President of the United States, within his discretion, to designate either a governmental agency or any other agency, such as the American Legion, the Salvation Army, or any other number of agencies he may select, to make the distribution for the relief of the distressed and suffering.

I can not escape the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that if President Hoover, fully cognizant of the distress and suffering which prevails throughout the entire country—and consistent with his former record as a great humanitarian—had frankly admitted to the country the gravity of the situation as it exists to-day, and courageously declared that the suffering women, children, and unemployed should be taken care of, regardless of what might come, he would have been considered one of the great men in American history.

I believe that the American people would have applauded such a stand, and I am sure that Congress would have co-operated with him in every relief measure that he might have proposed.

I can appreciate the feeling of pride which prompts the President's desire that under his administration Congress shall not take action such as it never has been called upon to take before in the history of this Nation, and appropriate money to feed the hungry people throughout the country. I can appreciate how the Republican leaders may wish to save the administration from making that sort of a record for the Republican Party. But the question, it seems to me, of relieving the suffering and starving should be paramount to any feeling of pride which anyone may have and outweigh any political considerations.

There are children. There are hungry women. There are strong men in the cities of this country who want employment and can not secure it—who are standing to-day with arms outstretched to Congress appealing for relief. They are asking Congress to show them as American citizens the same sympathy and generosity it showed to foreign citizens a few years ago. No such objections as are being made now were raised when relief was being provided for those in foreign lands.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman, of course, understands that Congress has made appropriations in two instances for buildings for the Red Cross, \$400,000 in 1913 as part payment for a Red Cross building (38 U. S. Stat. 233), and second, \$350,000 for a building in 1930 (46 U. S. Stat. 866). On another occasion Congress appropriated money to enable the Red Cross to be represented at the conference of Red Cross societies in London in 1907 (34 U. S. Stat. 1357). On another occasion Congress appropriated \$500,000 to provide for expense of exhibits at Pan-Pacific exposition held in San Francisco in 1915 for various bodies, including Red Cross. This appropriation was made in June, 1913 (38 U. S. Stat. 76). Another appropriation for the same purpose was made in August, 1914 (38 U. S. Stat. 669). Congress made still another appropriation for the Red Cross in March, 1923, to cover pay of claims for equipping nurses, and so forth, of \$848,067.29 (42 U. S. Stat. 1551).

There are probably other acts appropriating money by Congress for the activities of the Red Cross, but these are a few I have been able to find during the last 30 minutes of investigation.

Mr. BYRNS. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Statements have been placed in the Record showing nearly 100 instances, some as far back as 1803, where Congress has made similar appropriations—not for a great national emergency, as exists to-day, but for an emergency local in character, such as the earthquake in San Francisco and other instances, and no one raised a question then that Congress ought not to be called upon to make such appropriations.

I recall that several years ago an appropriation of several hundred thousand dollars was made to relieve the citizens of Salem, Mass., on account of a great fire which had occurred. No objection was made to that appropriation by the Red Cross or by the Representative in Congress from that

city. Neither did we hear any protests from its present Representative, my distinguished friend, Mr. LUCE, who is so earnest in his opposition to the pending appropriation.

There was no voice more eloquent, no person more insistent in the case of these foreign contributions than the President of the United States himself, who was then the Secretary of Commerce. If I had the time I could read to you numerous quotations from statements he made to the committee and to the country when he was appealing for these appropriations. I call attention simply to one contained in the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 3, 1924, supporting a bill to appropriate \$10,000,000 to relieve the women and children of Germany. This bill was passed by the House, but failed in the Senate. What did Mr. Hoover say in his appeal to the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of that \$10,000,000 appropriation? I quote:

Our only hope is that the next generation will be better than this one, and there is no hope if they are to be stunted and degenerate from undernourishment. I recognize the many arguments that may be brought against charitable actions either by private agencies or by our Government, but I refuse to apply these arguments to children.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman put in the Record the roll calls of the House on these different bills?

Mr. BYRNS. I shall be glad to do so if I can get the permission of the House. I have looked over the membership of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with interest to know just what members of the committee at that time are in the House to-day who were members of the committee when these bills were passed for \$100,000,000 for starving Europeans in 1919 and \$20,000,000 for starving Russians in 1921 and for the \$10,000,000 for hungry women and children in Germany to which I have just referred.

The bill for the relief of Russia was introduced by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, Doctor TEMPLE, and authorized an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the purchase and distribution of foodstuffs for the people in that country who were suffering from a severe drought. This appropriation was made pursuant to that authorization from funds of the United States Grain Corporation and which belonged to the Government since the United States was the only stockholder. In addition to this more than \$4,000,000 worth of medical supplies was ordered distributed for the benefit of those starving people. I find that the following gentlemen were on that Committee on Foreign Affairs which unanimously reported those bills. The first name is that of my distinguished friend, HENRY W. TEMPLE, of Pennsylvania, who is now the chairman of that committee. I find also the names of Mr. COOPER, of Wisconsin; EDWARD E. BROWNE, of Wisconsin; Mr. ACKERMAN, of New Jersey; ROBERT H. CLANCY, of Michigan; HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York; CYRENUS COLE, of Iowa; RICHARD S. ALDRICH, of Rhode Island; J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, of Maryland; Judge SABATH, of Illinois; R. WALTON MOORE, of Virginia; ROSS A. COLLINS, of Mississippi. These gentlemen were members of that committee when either all or some of these bills were reported, and I shall be interested in seeing just how all of these gentlemen who were so earnest and so anxious to relieve the starving Europeans in Russia and in Germany vote when it comes to giving some measure of relief for the same reason to the citizens of this great country of ours. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would also call the gentleman's attention to the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the starving women and children of Germany, which was reported favorably by the Foreign Affairs Committee and passed by this House in 1924.

Mr. BYRNS. I am very glad the gentleman has referred to that. I mentioned it briefly, and it is but another argument in favor of the passage of this appropriation.

The gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber have spent their time in seeking to get into the Record the idea that we on this side, in appropriating this money for the relief of the destitute and starving men, women, and

children of this country, are attempting to discredit the American Red Cross. They have otherwise made no defense of their untenable position. Everybody recognizes and appreciates the great work of this humanitarian organization which has followed in the wake of every disaster as an angel of mercy, and which would to-day gladly have the money we seek to appropriate if the central committee of that organization would consult their wishes. If a deadly blow is being struck at the Red Cross, as has been charged on the floor, then that blow is being struck by that committee. If the organization is to be discredited, the blame will lie at its door. If politics are being played it is they who are playing it, for they are serving as a screen behind which the President is attempting to hide his opposition to this relief appropriation.

Judge Payne stated that this is the greatest national disaster with which the country has ever been confronted and involved a national emergency equal to any which had ever been created by war. True, he said that the Red Cross was pledged to afford adequate relief but he confined this pledge to the relief of those who live in the drought-stricken areas of 21 States, and frankly stated that it was not the purpose of the Red Cross to give relief to the unemployed in the cities. The Federation of Labor has estimated that there are at least 5,700,000 persons who are unemployed, and when one remembers that most of them have families one can appreciate the appalling extent of this emergency.

The judge stated that local organizations in the various cities must take care of them. But he was careful to say that he did not know whether or not these local organizations were now adequately supplied with funds or whether they would be able to raise adequate funds in the future. What is to become of them if such funds are not raised and Congress should adjourn on March 4 without making some provision for their relief? He further said that there was now on hand from the disaster fund which the Red Cross had set apart for relief in the drought-stricken areas the sum of \$2,700,000, which, with the \$10,000,000 now being raised, would make a fund of \$13,000,000 for such relief. It was his opinion that something more than 1,000,000 persons living within these areas would have to be given financial assistance. It is easily seen, therefore, how inadequate this sum will be, even though confined to the drought-stricken sufferers. It is true he said that the Red Cross could take care of them, even though it required three times that amount. I do not for one moment question the sincerity of his statements or his determination to afford all necessary relief, but we are now in the midst of the greatest and longest period of depression this country has ever experienced. Many former liberal contributors to the Red Cross will not now be able to contribute as heretofore. Congress will adjourn on March 4. Suppose it should happen that the number of those to be relieved is greater than now anticipated and ample funds are not forthcoming, what will then become of those who need help? Is it not the wise thing for Congress to provide a fund which will be available in its absence if for any reason it should be needed? If it is not needed, then it will not be drawn from the Treasury. But I do not believe the great heart of America will approve the action of Congress in adjourning without making some fund available for possible contingencies. Neither do I believe that the unemployed in the cities should be neglected. This appropriation should be made available in order to enable either the Red Cross or the President to supplement any funds raised in the various cities if they should be found inadequate to meet the situation.

This proposal should not be misconstrued. The appropriation is sought to be made available and to be used only in the event it is required to alleviate suffering. I do not subscribe to the idea that its appropriation will serve to prevent the Red Cross from raising funds in the future. I place a much higher estimate on the charitable impulses of the American people, and we can all hope that never again will the country be confronted by such a great national emergency as now exists—one which Judge Payne declared to be equal to that caused by any war. To me it would be as reasonable

for us to expect the Red Cross to bear the expense of a great war. May I call attention to the fact that when the appropriation for \$100,000,000, advocated by President Wilson and also by Mr. Hoover, was pending in the House the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], who now believes that turning over this \$25,000,000 to the American Red Cross would sound the death knell of future contributions to that great organization, moved to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to report it back forthwith, providing that the money so appropriated should "be expended by the American National Red Cross" rather than by President Wilson. This was on January 13, 1919, and his motion appears on page 1449 of the Record of the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session. I leave it to the gentleman from Indiana to reconcile his attitude on that occasion with his vigorous opposition at this time. It is interesting to note that many gentlemen now in the House voted with the gentleman from Indiana on that occasion to recommit the bill and who are now as inconsistently inveighing against the proposition to make the pending appropriation available for the use of the Red Cross.

I append herewith the record of the vote cast upon that motion, and also upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Mr. Wood of Indiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 1, line 10, after the word 'President,' insert 'to be expended by the American National Red Cross.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 202, answered "present" 3, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

Yeas, 117: Anthony, Baer, Bland of Indiana, Blanton, Bowers, Browne, Browning, Burroughs, Butler, Campbell of Kansas, Cary, Chandler of New York, Chandler of Oklahoma, Clark of Pennsylvania, Classon, Cooper of West Virginia, Copley, Curry of California, Dale, Dallinger, Darrow, Davis, Dempsey, Denison, Dillon, Dowell, Dyer, Elliott, Esch, B. L. Fairchild, Fairfield, Fess, Focht, Fordney, Foss, Frear, Fuller of Illinois, Gillett, Glynn, Good, Goodall, Green of Iowa, Greene of Massachusetts, Greene of Vermont, Hadley, Hamilton of Michigan, Haskell, Haugen, Hawley, Hayes, Hersey, Hicks, Hollingsworth, Hull of Iowa, Johnson of Washington, Juul, Kelley of Michigan, Kennedy of Iowa, King, Kinkaid, Knutson, Kraus, La Follette, Little, Longworth, Lufkin, McArthur, McCulloch, McKenzie, McLaughlin of Michigan, McLaughlin of Pennsylvania, Madden, Magee, Mann, Mason, Miller of Washington, Moore of Pennsylvania, Moores of Indiana, Morgan, Mott, Mudd, Nolan, Osborne, Paige, Purnell, Ramseyer, Rankin, Robbins, Rodenberg, Rogers, Rose, Sanders of New York, Scholl, Scott of Iowa, Sells, Sinnott, Sloan, Snell, Snyder, Steenerson, Stiness, Sweet, Swift, Switzer, Tilson, Timberlake, Tinkham, Towner, Treadway, Vestal, Ward, Wheeler, White of Maine, Williams, Winslow, Wood of Indiana, and Woodyard.

Nays, 202: Alexander, Almon, Anderson, Aswell, Austin, Ayres, Bankhead, Beakes, Bell, Benson, Beshlin, Black, Blackmon, Bland of Virginia, Booher, Brodbeck, Buchanan, Burnett, Byrnes of South Carolina, Byrns of Tennessee, Caldwell, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Cannon, Cantrill, Caraway, Carew, Carlin, Carter of Oklahoma, Church, Cleary, Coady, Collier, Connally of Texas, Connelly of Kansas, Cooper of Ohio, Cooper of Wisconsin, Crampton, Crisp, Crosser, Currie of Michigan, Davey, Decker, Dent, Denton, Dewalt, Dickinson, Dies, Dill, Dixon, Dominick, Donovan, Dooling, Doolittle, Doremus, Doughton, Drukker, Ellsworth, Elston, Emerson, Evans, Farr, Ferris, Fields, Fisher, Flood, Foster, Freeman, French, Gallagher, Gallivan, Gandy, Gard, Garner, Garrett of Tennessee, Garrett of Texas, Godwin of North Carolina, Goodwin of Arkansas, Gordon, Gray of Alabama, Griffin, Hamlin, Hardy, Harrison of Virginia, Hastings, Hayden, Heflin, Hensley, Holland, Houston, Huddleston, Hull of Tennessee, Humphreys, Igoe, Jacoway, James, Johnson of Kentucky, Jones, Kehoe, Kelly of Pennsylvania, Kettner, Kincheloe, Kitchin, LaGuardia, Lampert, Larsen, Lazaro, Lea of California, Lee of Georgia, Lever, Linthicum, Lobeck, London, Lonergan, Lunn, McAndrews, McKeown, McLemore, Maher, Mansfield, Mapes, Martin, Merritt, Mondell, Moon, A. P. Nelson, J. M. Nelson, Nicholls of South Carolina, Nichols of Michigan, Oldfield, Oliver of Alabama, Olney, O'Shaunessy, Overmyer, Overstreet, Padgett, Parker of New Jersey, Phelan, Polk, Pou, Quin, Ragsdale, H. T. Rainey, J. W. Rainey, Raker, Randall, Rayburn, Riordan, Romjue, Rubey, Rucker, Sabath, Sanders of Louisiana, Sanford, Saunders of Virginia, Scott of Michigan, Sears, Shallenberger, Shirley, Sherwood, Shouse, Sims, Sisson, Small, Smith of Idaho, C. B. Smith, T. F. Smith, Snook,

Stafford, Steagall, Stedman, Steele, Stephens of Mississippi, Stephens of Nebraska, Stevenson, Sullivan, Sumners, Tague, Taylor of Arkansas, Temple, Thompson, Tillman, Van Dyke, Venable, Vinson, Voigt, Volstead, Walsh, Walton, Watkins, Watson of Virginia, Weaver, Welling, Welty, Whaley, Wilson of Illinois, Wilson of Louisiana, Wilson of Texas, Wingo, Wise, Wright, Young of North Dakota, and Young of Texas.

Answered "present," 3: Barnhart, Harrison of Mississippi, and Taylor of Colorado.

Not voting, 108: Ashbrook, Bacharach, Barkley, Birch, Borland, Brand, Britten, Brumbaugh, Candler of Mississippi, Carter of Massachusetts, Clark of Florida, Claypool, Costello, Cox, Crago, Delaney, Drane, Dunn, Dupré, Eagan, Eagle, Edmonds, Essen, Estopinal, G. W. Fairchild, Flynn, Francis, Fuller of Massachusetts, Garland, Gould, Graham of Illinois, Graham of Pennsylvania, Gray of New Jersey, Gregg, Griest, Hamill, Hamilton of New York, Heaton, Heintz, Helm, Helvering, Hilliard, Hood, Howard, Husted, Hutchinson, Ireland, Johnson of South Dakota, Kahn, Kearns, Keating, Kennedy of Rhode Island, Key of Ohio, Kiess of Pennsylvania, Kreider, Langley, Lehlbach, Leshner, Littlepage, Lundeen, McClintic, McCormick, McFadden, McKinley, Mays, Miller of Minnesota, Montague, Morin, Neely, Norton, Oliver of New York, Park, Parker of New York, Peters, Platt, Porter, Powers, Pratt, Price, Ramsey, Reavis, Reed, Roberts, Robinson, Rouse, Rowe, Rowland, Russell, Sanders of Indiana, Scully, Shackelford, Siegel, Slayden, Slemp, Smith of Michigan, Steenerson, Stephens of Mississippi, Sterling, Strong, Templeton, Thomas, Vare, Waldow, Walker, Wason, Watson of Pennsylvania, Webb, White of Ohio, Woods of Iowa, and Zihlman.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 73, answered "present" 1, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

Yeas, 242: Alexander, Anderson, Aswell, Austin, Ayres, Barnhart, Beakes, Bell, Benson, Beshlin, Black, Bland of Virginia, Blanton, Booher, Brodbeck, Browning, Buchanan, Burnett, Burroughs, Byrnes of South Carolina, Byrns of Tennessee, Caldwell, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Cannon, Cantrill, Caraway, Carew, Carter of Oklahoma, Cary, Classon, Cleary, Coady, Collier, Connally of Texas, Connelly of Kansas, Cooper of Ohio, Cooper of Wisconsin, Cramton, Crisp, Crosser, Currie of Michigan, Dalling, Darrow, Davey, Decker, Dempsey, Dent, Denton, Dewalt, Dickinson, Dill, Dillon, Dixon, Donovan, Dooling, Doolittle, Doremus, Doughton, Drukker, Ellsworth, Elston, Emerson, Esch, Farr, Ferris, Fields, Fisher, Flood, Fordney, Foss, Foster, Freeman, French, Fuller of Illinois, Gallagher, Gallivan, Gandy, Gard, Garner, Garrett of Tennessee, Garrett of Texas, Glynn, Godwin of North Carolina, Goodwin of Arkansas, Gray of Alabama, Greene of Vermont, Griffin, Hadley, Hamilton of Michigan, Hamlin, Hardy, Harrison of Virginia, Haskell, Hastings, Hayden, Heflin, Hensley, Hicks, Holland, Houston, Huddleston, Hull of Tennessee, Humphreys, Igoe, Jacoway, James, Johnson of Kentucky, Jones, Juul, Keating, Kehoe, Kelley of Michigan, Kelly of Pennsylvania, Kettner, Kincheloe, King, Kinkaid, Kitchin, LaGuardia, Lampert, Larsen, Lazaro, Lea of California, Lee of Georgia, Lever, Linthicum, Little, Lobeck, London, Lonergan, Longworth, Lufkin, Lunn, McAndrews, McCulloch, McLemore, Magee, Maher, Mann, Mansfield, Mapes, Martin, Merritt, Miller of Washington, Mondell, Moon, Moores of Indiana, Morgan, Mudd, A. P. Nelson, J. M. Nelson, Nichols of Michigan, Nolan, Oldfield, Oliver of Alabama, Olney, Osborne, O'Shaunessy, Overmyer, Overstreet, Padgett, Paige, Parker of New Jersey, Phelan, Polk, Porter, Pou, Purnell, Quin, Ragsdale, H. T. Rainey, J. W. Rainey, Raker, Ramseyer, Randall, Rankin, Rayburn, Rogers, Romjue, Rose, Rubey, Rucker, Sabbath, Sanders of Louisiana, Sanford, Scott of Michigan, Sears, Shallenberger, Sherley, Shouse, Sims, Sinnott, Small, Smith of Idaho, C. B. Smith, T. F. Smith, Snook, Stafford, Steagall, Stedman, Steele, Stephens of Nebraska, Stevenson, Stiness, Sullivan, Sumners, Swift, Switzer, Tague, Taylor of Arkansas, Taylor of Colorado, Temple, Thompson, Tillman, Tilson, Tinkham, Treadway, Van Dyke, Venable, Vestal, Vinson, Voigt, Volstead, Walsh, Walton, Watkins, Watson of Virginia, Weaver, Welling, Welty, Whaley, Wheeler, White of Maine, Wilson of Louisiana, Wilson of Texas, Wingo, Winslow, Wise, Wright, Young of North Dakota, and Young of Texas.

Nays, 73: Almon, Anthony, Baer, Bankhead, Blackmon, Bland of Indiana, Bowers, Browne, Butler, Campbell of Kansas, Chandler of New York, Chandler of Oklahoma, Clark of Pennsylvania, Cooper of West Virginia, Copley, Curry of California, Dale, Davis, Denison, Dies, Dominick, Dowell, Dyer, Elliott, B. L. Fairchild, Fairfield, Fess, Focht, Frear, Gillett, Goodall, Gordon, Green of Iowa, Greene of Massachusetts, Haugen, Hawley, Hayes, Hersey, Hollingsworth, Hull of Iowa, Johnson of Washington, Kearns, Kennedy of Iowa, Knutson, Kraus, La Follette, McArthur, McKenzie, McKeown, McLaughlin of Michigan, McLaughlin of Pennsylvania, Madden, Moore of Pennsylvania, Mott, Robbins, Rodenberg, Sanders of New York, Schall, Scott of Iowa, Sells, Sherwood, Sisson, Sloan, Snell, Snyder, Sweet, Timberlake, Towner, Ward, Williams, Wilson of Illinois, Wood of Indiana, and Woodyard.

Answered "present," 1: Harrison of Mississippi.

Not voting, 114: Ashbrook, Bacharach, Barkley, Birch, Borland, Brand, Britten, Brumbaugh, Candler of Mississippi, Carter of Massachusetts, Church, Clark of Florida, Claypool, Costello, Cox, Crago, Delaney, Drane, Dunn, Dupré, Eagan, Eagle, Edmonds, Essen, Estopinal, Evans, G. W. Fairchild, Flynn, Francis, Fuller of Massa-

chusetts, Garland, Good, Gould, Graham of Illinois, Graham of Pennsylvania, Gray of New Jersey, Gregg, Griest, Hamill, Hamilton of New York, Heaton, Heintz, Helm, Helvering, Hilliard, Hood, Howard, Husted, Hutchinson, Ireland, Johnson of South Dakota, Kahn, Kennedy of Rhode Island, Key of Ohio, Kiess of Pennsylvania, Kreider, Langley, Lehlbach, Leshner, Littlepage, Lundeen, McClintic, McCormick, McFadden, McKinley, Mason, Mays, Miller of Minnesota, Montague, Morin, Neely, Nicholls of South Carolina, Norton, Oliver of New York, Park, Parker of New York, Peters, Platt, Powers, Pratt, Price, Ramsey, Reavis, Reed, Riordan, Roberts, Robinson, Rouse, Rowe, Rowland, Russell, Sanders of Indiana, Saunders of Virginia, Scully, Shackelford, Siegel, Slayden, Slemp, Smith of Michigan, Steenerson, Stephens of Mississippi, Sterling, Strong, Templeton, Thomas, Vare, Waldow, Walker, Wason, Watson of Pennsylvania, Webb, White of Ohio, Woods of Iowa, and Zihlman.

So the bill was passed.

I also append herewith the record of the votes cast on the bill for the relief of the people of Russia as appears on page 582 of the RECORD of the Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.

The SPEAKER. Clearly there is no quorum present. The Door-keeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 71, answered "present" 4, not voting 175, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

Yeas, 181: Ackerman, Andrew of Massachusetts, Andrews of Nebraska, Anson, Anthony, Arentz, Barkley, Beck, Begg, Benham, Bird, Boies, Britten, Browne of Wisconsin, Bulwinkle, Burroughs, Butler, Cable, Campbell of Kansas, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Cantrill, Chalmers, Chandler of New York, Chandler of Oklahoma, Chindblom, Clague, Clarke of New York, Cockran, Cole of Ohio, Collins, Colton, Cooper of Ohio, Cooper of Wisconsin, Copley, Cramton, Crowther, Curry, Dallinger, Darrow, Davis of Minnesota, Dempsey, Dickinson, Doughton, Dowell, Dunbar, Dupré, Dyer, Elliott, Ellis, Evans, Fairchild, Fairfield, Faust, Fields, Fitzgerald, Fordney, Foster, Frear, French, Frothingham, Fuller, Garrett of Texas, Gerner, Gorman, Graham of Illinois, Green of Iowa, Greene of Massachusetts, Griffin, Hadley, Hardy of Colorado, Haugen, Hawley, Herrick, Hersey, Hickey, Hicks, Hill, Hoch, Hogan, Houghton, Huddleston, Hukriede, Husted, Ireland, Johnson of Kentucky, Johnson of Washington, Keller, Kelley of Michigan, Kelly of Pennsylvania, Ketcham, Kindred, King, Kinkaid, Kirkpatrick, Kissel, Kline of New York, Kline of Pennsylvania, Kopp, Lampert, Lankford, Larson of Minnesota, Linthicum, Little, London, Luce, Luhring, McCormick, McLaughlin of Nebraska, McPherson, Magee, Mapes, Martin, Merritt, Miller, Mills, Mon-dell, Montoya, Moore of Ohio, Moores of Indiana, Morgan, Mott, Mudd, Murphy, A. P. Nelson, J. M. Nelson, Newton of Minnesota, Padgett, Parker of New York, Purnell, Ramseyer, Reece, Reed of New York, Reed of West Virginia, Ricketts, Rogers, Rose, Sabbath, Sanders of New York, Schall, Scott of Michigan, Scott of Tennessee, Shelton, Shreve, Siegel, Sinclair, Sinnott, Smith of Idaho, Smith of Michigan, Snell, Speaks, Stedman, Stephens, Strong of Kansas, Summers of Washington, Sweet, Tague, Temple, Thompson, Tilson, Timberlake, Tinscher, Towner, Upshaw, Vestal, Voigt, Volstead, Walters, Ward of North Carolina, Watson, Weaver, Wheeler, White of Kansas, White of Maine, Williamson, Winslow, Woodruff, Woods of Virginia, Wyant, Yates, Young, and Zihlman.

Nays, 71: Almon, Aswell, Bankhead, Black, Bland of Virginia, Bowling, Box, Buchanan, Burdick, Byrnes of South Carolina, Bryns of Tennessee, Carter, Clouse, Connolly of Texas, Crisp, Deal, Drewry, Driver, Fess, Freeman, Fulmer, Garrett of Tennessee, Gensman, Goodykoontz, Greene of Vermont, Hammer, Jacoway, Jeffers of Alabama, Jones of Texas, Kraus, Lanham, Larsen of Georgia, Layton, Lazaro, Lee of Georgia, Logan, Lowrey, McDuffie, Madden, Moore of Virginia, Oldfield, Oliver, Overstreet, Park of Georgia, Parks of Arkansas, Parrish, Rankin, Rayburn, Robertson, Robison, Rouse, Sanders of Texas, Sandlin, Smithwick, Sproul, Stafford, Steagall, Steenerson, Stevenson, Stoll, Swank, Taylor of Tennessee, Tillman, Tyson, Valle, Vinson, Walsh, Wason, Wingo, Wise, and Wright.

Answered "present," 4: McSwain, Porter, Sumners of Texas, and Treadway.

Not voting, 175: Anderson, Appleby, Atkeson, Bacharach, Barbour, Beedy, Bell, Bixler, Blakeney, Bland of Indiana, Blanton, Bond, Bowers, Brand, Brennan, Briggs, Brinson, Brooks of Illinois, Brooks of Pennsylvania, Brown of Tennessee, Burke, Burness, Burton, Cannon, Carew, Christopher, Clark of Florida, Classon, Codd, Cole of Iowa, Collier, Connell, Connolly of Pennsylvania, Coughlin, Crago, Cullen, Dale, Davis of Tennessee, Denison, Dominick, Drane, Dunn, Echols, Edmonds, Favrot, Fenn, Fish, Fisher, Focht, Free, Funk, Gahn, Gallivan, Garner, Gilbert, Glynn, Goldsborough, Gould, Graham of Pennsylvania, Griest, Hardy of Texas, Harrison, Hawes, Hayden, Hays, Himes, Hooker, Hudspeth, Hull, Humphreys, Hutchinson, James, Jeffers of Nebraska, Johnson of Mississippi, Johnson of South Dakota, Jones of Pennsylvania, Kahn, Kearns, Kendall, Kennedy, Kiess, Kincheloe, Kitchin, Kleczka, Knight, Knutson, Kreider, Kunz, Langley, Lawrence, Lea of California, Leatherwood, Lee of New York, Lehlbach, Ltneberger, Longworth, Lyon, McArthur, McClintic, McFadden, McKenzie, McLaughlin of Michigan, McLaughlin of Pennsylvania, MacGregor, Maloney, Mann, Mansfield, Mead, Michaelson, Michener, Mills, Montague, Moore of Illinois,

Morin, Newton of Missouri, Nolan, Norton, O'Brien, O'Connor, Ogden, Olpp, Osborne, Palge, Parker of New Jersey, Patterson of Missouri, Patterson of New Jersey, Perkins, Perlman, Peters, Petersen, Pou, Pringle, Quin, Radcliffe, Rainey of Alabama, Rainey of Illinois, Raker, Ransley, Reavis, Reber, Rhodes, Riddick, Riordan, Roach, Rodenberg, Rosenbloom, Rosedale, Rucker, Ryan, Sanders of Indiana, Sears, Shaw, Sisson, Slomp, Snyder, Stiness, Strong of Pennsylvania, Sullivan, Swing, Taylor of Arkansas, Taylor of Colorado, Taylor of New Jersey, Ten Eyck, Thomas, Tinkham, Underhill, Vare, Volk, Ward of New York, Webster, Williams, Wilson, Wood of Indiana, Woodyard, and Wurzbach.

So the bill was passed.

The following is the record vote which was cast on the bill providing for the relief of women and children of Germany, as appears upon page 5021 of the RECORD of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Obviously there is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 97, answered "present" 3, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

Yeas, 240: Ackerman, Allen, Arnold, Bacharach, Barbour, Barkley, Beck, Beers, Begg, Berger, Black of New York, Boies, Boyce, Boylan, Britten, Browne of Wisconsin, Brumm, Buchanan, Buckley, Bulwinkle, Burdick, Burtness, Burton, Cable, Campbell, Canfield, Cannon, Carew, Casey, Celler, Clague, Clancy, Clarke of New York, Cleary, Cole of Iowa, Cole of Ohio, Colton, Connery, Cook, Cooper of Wisconsin, Cooper of Ohio, Corning, Cramton, Croll, Crosser, Crowther, Cullen, Cummings, Dallinger, Darrow, Davey, Davis of Minnesota, Denison, Dickinson of Missouri, Dickinson of Iowa, Dickstein, Dowell, Dyer, Eagan, Elliott, Evans of Iowa, Evans of Montana, Fairchild, Fairfield, Faust, Favrot, Fish, Fisher, Fitzgerald, Foster, Frear, French, Fullbright, Fuller, Funk, Gardner of Indiana, Geran, Glatfelter, Goldsborough, Graham of Illinois, Green of Iowa, Greenwood, Griffin, Hadley, Hardy, Haugen, Hawes, Hawley, Hayden, Hickey, Hill of Washington, Hill of Maryland, Howard of Nebraska, Huddleston, Hudson, Hudspeth, Hull of Tennessee, Hull of Iowa, William E. Hull, Jacobstein, James, Johnson of Washington, Johnson of West Virginia, Jost, Kearns, Keller, Kent, Kerr, Ketcham, Kindred, King, Kopp, Kunz, Kurtz, Kvale, LaGuardia, Lampert, Larson of Minnesota, Lea of California, Leatherwood, Lehlbach, Lindsay, Linthicum, Little, Logan, Longworth, Lozier, McKenzie, McLaughlin of Michigan, McLaughlin of Nebraska, McLeod, McSweeney, MacGregor, MacLafferty, Magee of New York, Major of Illinois, Major of Missouri, Manlove, Mansfield, Mapes, Mead, Michener, Miller of Washington, Milligan, Mills, Minahan, Mooney, Moore of Illinois, Moore of Ohio, Moores of Indiana, Morehead, Morgan, Morin, Murphy, Nelson of Wisconsin, Newton of Missouri, Newton of Minnesota, O'Brien, O'Connell of New York, O'Connell of Rhode Island, O'Connor of Louisiana, O'Connor of New York, O'Sullivan, Oliver of New York, Paige, Parker, Patterson, Perkins, Perlman, Porter, Prall, Purnell, Ragon, Rainey, Raker, Ramseyer, Rathbone, Richards, Roach, Robinson of Iowa, Rogers of Massachusetts, Rogers of New Hampshire, Romjue, Rosenbloom, Rouse, Rubey, Sabath, Sanders of Indiana, Schafer, Schall, Scott, Sears of Nebraska, Seger, Shallenberger, Sherwood, Shreve, Simmons, Sinclair, Sinnott, Sites, Smith, Speaks, Sproul of Illinois, Stedman, Stengle, Stephens, Strong of Kansas, Sweet, Swing, Tague, Thatcher, Thompson, Tilson, Timberlake, Treadway, Underwood, Upshaw, Valle, Vincent of Michigan, Voigt, Wainwright, Watkins, Watres, Watson, Weaver, Wefald, White of Kansas, White of Maine, Williams of Michigan, Williamson, Wilson of Indiana, Wingo, Winslow, Winter, Wolf, Wood, Woodruff, Wurzbach, Wyant, Young.

Nays, 97: Abernethy, Allgood, Almon, Andrew, Anthony, Aswell, Ayres, Bacon, Bankhead, Bell, Bixler, Black of Texas, Blanton, Bowling, Box, Brand of Ohio, Brand of Georgia, Browne of New Jersey, Browning, Busby, Butler, Byrnes of South Carolina, Byrnes of Tennessee, Carter, Collier, Collins, Connally of Texas, Crisp, Curry, Davis of Tennessee, Deal, Dominick, Drane, Driver, Fleetwood, Free, Freeman, Fulmer, Garrett of Texas, Gasque, Gibson, Harrison, Hastings, Hersey, Hill of Alabama, Hoch, Hooker, Humphreys, Jeffers, Johnson of Texas, Jones, Kincheloe, Lanham, Lankford, Larsen of Georgia, Lazaro, Lowrey, McDuffie, McKeown, McReynolds, McSwain, Martin, Moore of Georgia, Moore of Virginia, Nelson of Maine, Oliver of Alabama, Park of Georgia, Parks of Arkansas, Peery, Quin, Rankin, Rayburn, Reece, Reed of Arkansas, Robison of Kentucky, Salmon, Sanders of Texas, Sandlin, Sears of Florida, Snyder, Sproul of Kansas, Steagall, Swank, Taber, Taylor of West Virginia, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tillman, Tinscher, Tucker, Underhill, Vinson of Georgia, Vinson of Kentucky, Williams of Texas, Wilson of Louisiana, Wilson of Mississippi, Woodrum, and Wright.

Answered "present," 3: Garrett of Tennessee, Kiess, Sumners of Texas.

Not voting, 91: Aldrich, Anderson, Beedy, Bland, Bloom, Briggs, Chindblom, Christopherson, Clark of Florida, Connolly of Pennsylvania, Dempsey, Doughton, Doyle, Drewry, Edmonds, Fenn, Fredericks, Frothingham, Gallivan, Garber, Garner of Texas, Gifford, Gilbert, Graham of Pennsylvania, Greene of Massachusetts, Griest, Hammer, Holaday, Howard of Oklahoma, Morton D. Hull,

Johnson of Kentucky, Johnson of South Dakota, Kahn, Kelly, Kendall, Knutson, Langley, Leavitt, Lee of Georgia, Lilly, Lineberger, Luce, Lyon, McClintic, McFadden, McNulty, Madden, Magee of Pennsylvania, Merritt, Michaelson, Miller of Illinois, Montague, Morris, Morrow, Nolan, Oldfield, Peavey, Phillips, Pou, Quayle, Ransley, Roed of New York, Reed of West Virginia, Reid of Illinois, Sanders of New York, Schneider, Smithwick, Snell, Stalker, Stevenson, Strong of Pennsylvania, Sullivan, Summers of Washington, Swoope, Taylor of Colorado, Taylor of Tennessee, Temple, Thomas of Kentucky, Tinkham, Tydings, Vare, Vestal, Ward of New York, Ward of North Carolina, Wason, Weller, Welsh, Wertz, Williams of Illinois, Yates, Zihlman.

So the joint resolution was passed.

Under leave I append herewith an editorial from the Boston Post of January 20, 1931, which clearly emphasizes the importance of action by Congress.

FEED THE HUNGRY

For the sake of suffering humanity the Congress should pass and the President should approve the \$25,000,000 relief measure which the Senate yesterday finally embodied in the bill before it. The money should be turned over to the Red Cross at once. The Red Cross should spend a part or all of it as speedily as conditions warrant.

In advocating this extraordinary procedure, the Post retains full sympathy with the idea of the Red Cross, that its funds should be derived from popular subscriptions. The Post also recognizes that in normal times it is not the province of the Federal Government to undertake this form of relief. But it believes that a great emergency exists now and that the paramount object is to provide the money so urgently needed as soon as humanly possible. Delay is likely to cause untold suffering and many deaths.

It is midwinter now. Privation is reaching its peak. Destitution will certainly not decrease during the remainder of this month and during February or March. The admirable campaign of the Red Cross, now under way, will necessarily be a long slow job. Voluntary subscriptions will doubtless lag. And in the meantime, men, women, and children will be starving or freezing through no fault of their own. Surely it is not to be said of this country that they will be permitted to suffer simply because the exercise of Government aid in this crisis may be designated as a dole, or because the idea of Government aid is considered a bad precedent. To the hungry, the ill-clad, and the miserable the immediate necessity of relief is of far greater import than the question as to where the money is coming from.

If the House refuses to concur with the Senate provision or if the President vetoes the measure it will mean that long weeks must pass before the "Greatest Mother" can feed and clothe and warm her hapless charges. There is doubtless need for every cent the Red Cross can raise in addition to the \$25,000,000 the Government should donate. That \$25,000,000 just about represents the cost of one cruiser. Which is more important, a new cruiser or alleviation of the oppressed?

It may not be the "American idea," this governmental assistance of the unfortunate. But it is the American idea to see to it that the richest nation does not turn its back on those who have the right to expect the benison of its abundance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. When do we vote on these various amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the proper construction of the agreement made last night is to vote on all the amendments in their proper order at the close of the two hours' debate.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to briefly revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the roll calls on the bills to which I have referred and also an editorial from the Boston Post which was printed on January 20, a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks and to include various roll calls and an editorial from the Boston Post. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. And would the gentleman also agree to include another editorial which was printed in another Post, the Washington Post, this morning?

Mr. BYRNS. I shall not object to the gentleman doing that.

Mr. CRAMTON. It would be, perhaps, embarrassing for me to insert a Washington Post editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as I have had occasion before to call to the attention of the House, I chance to be the chairman of the committee to which legislation relating to the American Red Cross is referred, and so I feel some re-

sponsibility in connection therewith and believe it a resultant duty to inform the House if I can as to what the pending proposals mean to this institution.

The American Red Cross is fighting for its life. I am here to contribute what I can to the preservation of its life.

We are confronted with a great problem, that of relief. It has two branches—that of relief for drought-stricken areas and, very much more considerable, that of relief in the urban centers. For a time the Red Cross was concerned with this problem only in connection with the first matter, that of the drought, but now the Senate brings in city relief by an amendment in which our concurrence is asked, thus greatly broadening the scope of the dangers threatening our noblest American institution.

In the drought matter we have acted thoroughly, with reasonable promptness, and with sufficiency. We have made a great appropriation of \$45,000,000 to lend to the stricken farmers. We have acted in other directions through appropriations for the construction work of roads, rivers, and harbors, greatly increasing the amount of money that will be available in suffering districts for work in the next few months.

In December I went to the chairman of the central committee of the Red Cross and asked him what they could do. He told me they had \$5,000,000 at command and if they needed more they would get it.

That chairman has now come before the Appropriations Committee of the House and, with still more emphasis, has said if more money is needed they can get it. He says that if three times as much as is now contemplated by this campaign for \$10,000,000 throughout the country should be needed, they will get it.

This morning I received from my own city a letter reporting to me it had doubled the quota allotted to it by the Red Cross. [Applause.]

In face of that, men who are desiring to enlist public bounty in these matters are continually spreading abroad the report that the Red Cross can not raise funds. It came near not being able to do that. Its campaign came very near being wrecked by those who are spreading abroad the belief that for charity the people can and must resort to the Treasury of the United States.

Then there were summoned to restore confidence among the people the President of the Nation, ex-President Coolidge, and former Governor Smith, recently candidate of the Democratic Party for President, who with others, restored confidence, reassured the people, made clear to them that they could not evade their duty by recourse to the Treasury of the United States. Now, by leaps and bounds contributions are coming in, and once more the people of the United States will show that great heart in which we take so much pride, the heart that attests the progress of civilization itself.

To-day, in order to escape the facts, in order the more to befool the issue, we are confronted with the proposal that this \$25,000,000 shall be distributed by the President or under his direction, wherever he sees fit. One amendment still contains that most dangerous feature found in the words "Red Cross"; the other amendment would give the President power unqualified, but therewith still greater grows the menace to every form of voluntary giving.

In November in the British Parliament, in the face of stout opposition, demand was made and granted that the funds to be put at the command of the dole system should be increased to \$350,000,000. In the first week of this month in Germany the Financial Minister announced his determination to stop the dole and told the people of Germany that with it the nation could not survive. He said there were 4,000,000 people standing on the brink of despair, and the first remedy was to stop the system that it is now proposed to introduce here. Thus we find that in other countries of the world, faced by similar crises, the lesson is, "Do not resort to governmental charity."

But gentlemen say the Red Cross has previously made gifts to sufferers from disaster. It previously has cared for human suffering, and therefore should undertake that once again here. What were the circumstances? Shattered gov-

ernments; no organized charities; nobody to distribute money, even if it were to be had; distress beyond the power of any country to alleviate by itself—a vastly different situation from that which prevails in this land of ours. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] tell the Members of this House that he desires to suggest to us that Tennessee is in the same situation as was Russia? Will the gentleman from Arkansas rise and say that Arkansas is in the same situation as was Belgium? Thousands and millions of our people are still in receipt of incomes that keep them from distress. Thousands and millions of our people can contribute from their own resources to the aid of their neighbors.

It is a false issue that ought not be here introduced; false, because conditions are absolutely different.

Let us proceed to the question of giving to those out of employment and in need in the cities. Twenty-five million dollars is a dribble in comparison with what will have to be raised. Just think of what we already have done. Millions on millions of dollars appropriated here for public buildings, for highways, for rivers and harbors, for loans to the farmers of the South; millions on millions more by States and municipalities; literally billions in all for public and corporation works to be undertaken. Contrast the enormous, the inconceivable total with the \$25,000,000 dribble that is here proposed.

I do not desire to ascribe motives to anybody. I do not wish to say that this is done for political purposes. I do say it is done blindly, thoughtlessly, for some purpose that no man can fathom. If it is not done for politics, is it done for the purpose of socializing the Government, in bringing us to the pitch that England has reached, that Germany has reached, of resorting to the Public Treasury to succor those who are in distress?

May that day never come when men shall forget their responsibilities as men rather than as voters! May the day never come when they shall be called upon, through the mechanical processes of tax gathering, to destroy all individual impulses toward charity. Remember that charity blesses not only him that gives but him that takes. You want to destroy the blessing which comes to him that gives. Instead of giving charity you want to pay charity. The very words of the phrase show its implications. Pay charity! I deny that should be the function of the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, there are several good reasons why the Senate amendments should not be concurred in. First, it is a challenge to the efficiency of the Red Cross organization. Those of us that listened to the testimony the other day were convinced of the fact that the Red Cross had assumed this responsibility, that they were meeting every demand, that they had all the available funds they needed; that if they did not have sufficient funds in their treasury now they knew of certain trust funds they already have upon which they could draw.

They told us emphatically they were going to meet the demand and that they would meet it if it cost three times as much as the highest estimated demand at the present time. They also said they were giving the people in every locality the rations and the needs which the local committee from that locality said they should have. [Applause.] If the people do not know what is needed in those localities then it is not the fault of the Red Cross, because they are meeting every demand that is imposed upon them by those local committees. If that is the case then tell me why we should have this challenge made here, and this is a challenge of the efficiency of the Red Cross organization. The man who votes to concur in the Senate amendment votes his challenge of the efficiency of an organization that has met every demand made upon it both in peace and in war. [Applause.]

Not only that, but this is entirely different from the situation that is being referred to here by various Members on the other side. When we voted money out of the Public

Treasury for the starving in Russia there was not a condition there such as we have in Arkansas now. Society is in an organized state in Arkansas. The State of Arkansas is functioning; its local units are functioning and there is no disorganization there. In that State there is a place to which the people can go and have their demands met. Yet you are asking that we cast a vote of censure on the Red Cross organization by saying to them, "We are going to destroy you, take you out of the class of charitable organizations, and put you in a class where you are going to be dependent upon appropriations out of the Public Treasury." I know of no greater blow that can be struck at the Red Cross organization.

I want to say to you that this is not only my belief, but it is the belief of the highest officials of the Red Cross organization who appeared before our committee. They say the only embarrassment they are having now is the fact that people are saying to them, "We do not want to make our donations to the Red Cross if in turn you are going to accept funds out of the Public Treasury in order to carry out the program which you have carried out all these years, and carried out so well through private donations."

Now, one more thing. Why do we have these letters and these appeals read to Congress? Everyone knows that in the present state of condition you can always find some person who will write a letter of appeal. We have no suffering in Iowa. We have hardships, yes, but no suffering; and yet Members of the Iowa delegation receive these letters and appeals. The reason why people write these letters and appeals is because for some reason or other they do not want to go to the usual channels that are provided, and, therefore, they want to write to an authority higher up.

Let me suggest to you that \$25,000,000 would not start the relief of suffering in the United States. I was in New York City the other day. I know as little about New York City as any section of the United States, and yet I noticed in the public press that day that it raised \$8,000,000 for the very purpose for which you are now asked to appropriate money out of the Treasury. One city alone raised \$8,000,000.

Let us vote for the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] to insist on our disagreement to the Senate amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Hastings]. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, everyone must appreciate the emergency which necessitates some form of relief. This country has never been confronted with such an acute condition as exists at present. It is not only state-wide—it is nation-wide. This acute condition has been in existence for more than a year. The general business depression has swept away the savings of thousands of people for a number of years. The general depression, extending beyond the stock-market crash of October, 1929, has continued throughout the dreary months that followed. The end is not in sight. No one can predict with any degree of certainty when we will turn the corner in the road of business depression.

Accentuating this, we had the most disastrous drought during the summer of 1930 ever experienced in our country. Twenty-one States were affected.

In considering this emergency relief, in order to get a true picture of the situation in the drought-stricken area, we must keep in mind that because of the business depression that has continued for the past two or three years the people in the drought-stricken areas were in a distressful financial condition before the loss of their crops in 1930. In the areas affected many had nothing to live upon. They had gradually sold off most of their cattle and hogs to meet their pressing financial obligations; they had retained only the most necessary livestock. Most of them had not been able to meet their obligations of the year before and were carried over by the banks and supply houses for the year 1930. We must get this picture if we are to understand fully the situation in the drought-affected areas. The people were exhausted to begin with.

Recognizing the distressful condition of these people, efforts were made to relieve them, first, by making an appropriation of \$60,000,000 to make loans to those in dire distress, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to accept crop mortgages as security. This contemplated a repayment, and experience has shown that from 75 to 90 per cent of such loans previously made under such circumstances have been repaid. This effort to relieve these people was contemptuously denounced as a "dole." The truth is, it was intended to be, and was, a loan extended to relieve suffering humanity. They were willing to make loans for "feed" for livestock, but were unwilling to make loans for "food" for starving women and children.

When this effort failed to authorize loans to be made to supply "food" to those in distress, the Senate added amendment No. 144 to the Interior Department appropriation bill, which is as follows:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

This amendment provides for an appropriation of \$25,000,000, making it immediately available, which is to be expended through the National Red Cross to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency.

This clearly shows that no effort was made to embarrass anyone, and the Red Cross was selected because of its nation-wide organization, its experience in relief work, and it expressed the confidence of Congress in that organization.

It is not apparent why this organization could not expend this money to be appropriated from the Federal Treasury with the same care and efficiency as if the same were collected through public subscriptions. However, inasmuch as the head of the National Red Cross has appeared before the committee and has stated that his organization did not want to assume the responsibility of accepting this money, to be used for relief purposes, I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Taylor] substituting the President of the United States for the Red Cross, so that if the money is appropriated it may be placed at the disposal of the President to be by him disbursed, through such agencies as he may choose, for the relief of suffering humanity, if it be found that other relief is not adequate to meet the situation.

Congress will adjourn on March 4. In my judgment there should be some fund, definite in amount, which may be drawn upon to meet the situation in the event it is found that voluntary subscriptions may prove inadequate. For my part I am willing to place this money at the disposal of the President of the United States and trust him to select such agencies as he may think best fitted to perform the services to extend this relief.

It was attempted to be argued before the committee that the National Red Cross was able to handle the situation. It was stated by its chairman, Mr. Payne, that his organization had approximately \$3,000,000 available for expenditures for this relief work at the present time. That there had been expended to January 27, 1931, the sum of \$2,860,994.60. Relief had been extended to 959,000 people. It was estimated by the chairman of the Red Cross that the peak would be reached in January, 1931, and the chairman roughly estimated that there would be 1,000,000 people needing assistance through his organization.

When an effort was made to get more accurate or detailed information upon which this opinion was based irritation was exhibited, and the record does not disclose the detailed information that Congress should have as to the number of people who would probably need relief in any locality of the country. Figures were given as to the number that had been relieved in certain localities, but no accurate survey has been made showing the number of

people it would probably be necessary to assist in any county in any State in the United States.

It is true 57,000 families have been assisted in Arkansas, and it is estimated that 50,000 more families will need assistance in that State, but when inquiry was made as to the number in any one county it disclosed that no accurate, dependable survey had been made that would justify the statement as to how many people would probably need relief in any locality in any State throughout the United States.

It was estimated that the 57,000 families in Arkansas would average five to a family, making 285,000 persons being cared for there at the present time. It was estimated that perhaps 50,000 more families would need relief, which would run the number up to approximately half a million people in one State.

The chairman of the Red Cross placed his estimate at 1,000,000 people, but I want to repeat, in order to emphasize it, that this is a general estimate and that no detailed survey has been made with the figures added together so as to aggregate that many people.

Testimony was offered as to the number of pounds of food with which people were supplied. It was stated that upon the blank forms provided by the Red Cross orders were given on supply houses and stores for this food. Inquiry disclosed that the amount furnished per person for 30 days averaged from 101 to 120 pounds, and that the average cost per person per month of 30 days was \$2 per month. Remember that this is 6½ cents per day per person, which is 2½ cents per meal. In our estimates for feeding prisoners in Federal penitentiaries we appropriate on a basis of 29 cents per day. In justification of this small amount, statements of some three or four persons from Arkansas were introduced to the effect that this was the usual amount supplied to farmers in that State by supply houses which made a business of taking care of farmers during the crop season.

Now here is the fallacy of such a comparison. We must remember that we are experiencing the worst business depression we have had in a number of years in this country. The funds of these farmers have been entirely depleted. Ordinarily every farmer who is in the habit of being cared for by the banks and supply houses and stores during the crop season has some supplies of food stored up, in addition to that which is advanced to him, and hence it has only been necessary for him to make arrangements with the supply houses for food to supplement the supplies he has at home. It is ordinarily only necessary to make arrangements to purchase sugar, coffee, and certain other supplies. Practically every farmer usually has his own feed and has killed some hogs and stored up the meat. Many have a cow which affords milk for the family. Practically all of them usually have some food supplies on hand.

What is the situation now: In the extreme drought-stricken areas very little was raised and the farmers were compelled to sacrifice too much of what they raised in order to meet their very pressing financial obligations. This resulted in the depletion of their supplies far below the ordinary average year. They had literally scraped the bottom of the flour barrel before any relief was extended to them. The testimony discloses that many of them, in their dire distress, were living on rabbits. Of course, if they had any supplies at home they would not be driven to that extremity. The truth is that many of them have no supplies at all at home to supplement, and therefore must depend upon securing all of their supplies from some other source to feed their starving families. Again, during the average year, when the business depression is not so great, nearly every farmer can find some little employment during the crop season from which he can secure a small amount of money, but the business depression is so great there is no opportunity for such employment. So it is clearly apparent that it is not a fair comparison to say that the Red Cross is furnishing those in need of relief with supplies either in quantity or value equal to those upon which the farmers live upon during the average crop season.

Few of those needing relief had any corn which might be made into meal to make bread. It is urged that some of them had a small quantity of green stuff. I challenge the experience of anyone to convince anyone that there is any sufficient amount of green stuff during the months of January and February which would in any measure relieve the suffering of the people.

I do not believe that 6½ cents per day per person, or 2½ cents per meal, is sufficient to nourish people who are attempting to make a crop during this coming season. They may subsist upon it. They may not die of starvation, but it is unthinkable that the Congress of the United States would sit idly by and permit our own people to be impoverished to the extent of compelling the people in these drought-stricken areas to live upon 6½ cents per day.

It was stated that in my State of Oklahoma, 69,700 people were being fed. The man from that State who was called before the committee, had only been there two weeks. Inquiry was made for detailed information from various counties, but none could be given.

I repeat, that we can not reply upon such indefinite statements. If each of the 3,500 chapters, through the 12,500 branches of the Red Cross, had made a careful survey and communicated that through the various State headquarters, then Congress would have had dependable information as to whether or not adequate relief could be given to the suffering people throughout the country without the necessity of an appropriation by Congress.

The Associated Press carries many stories of suffering in drought-stricken areas. A dispatch from Little Rock, Ark., by the United Press, dated January 27, stated that approximately 400,000 persons in Arkansas are in need of assistance.

The dispatches show that the State of Arkansas recognizes the very great suffering of her citizens and legislation is pending in that State authorizing a bond issue of \$15,000,000 to aid in this great emergency. In my own State of Oklahoma, there is pending, if there has not already been enacted, legislation appropriating \$400,000 to purchase seed to in part relieve suffering in that State.

It must be remembered that because of the business depression many business houses and banks in the drought-stricken areas have failed and farmers are unable to pay their taxes, and because they have been unable to collect all the taxes the several States are not in as good position to assist financially as they were when business conditions generally were different.

An Associated Press dispatch from Marvel, Ark., dated January 28, is as follows:

One meal a day, consisting usually of bread and molasses and perhaps beans or plain salt pork, is what the average drought-sufferer's family gets out of what the Red Cross gives him.

I am not criticizing the Red Cross, but quote this to indicate my fears of the inability of the Red Cross to afford adequate relief from voluntary contributions.

A survey made by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. during the first week in December, 1930, at the request of the President's Emergency Committee for Employment estimates that the number of unemployed in the United States at that time was between 4,500,000 and 5,000,000 persons.

It is answered that we have made extraordinary appropriations for road work, river and harbor work, and the construction of public buildings. I supported these appropriations, but they will afford only a small amount of work in certain localities where the money is expended. Most of the river and harbor work is done by contract and the contractors employ regular crews. The same is largely true of road work, though there is more opportunity for the employment of unskilled labor in the building of roads than in river and harbor work. However, the amount to be expended in road construction under emergency legislation can not afford anything like adequate relief through the employment of a large number of persons in many of these drought-stricken areas.

Let me repeat that my fears are that because of the nationwide business depression and because of the dire distress in the drought-stricken areas, and because of unemployment, estimated, after a careful survey, of approximately 5,000,000

people, that voluntary contributions will not be forthcoming sufficient to meet the situation, and for that reason I believe some emergency fund should be provided for, and since the Red Cross does not want to assume the responsibility of disbursing it, I believe that fund should be placed in the hands of the President of the United States to distribute through such agency as he may select for the relief of the destitute.

From the beginning of our Government Congress has not hesitated to make appropriations from the Federal Treasury, not only for relief in our own country but for the relief of suffering humanity in foreign countries as well.

Time after time appropriations have been made for the relief of Mississippi flood sufferers, and these were not criticized as "doles." They were for the purpose of relieving distress, and that is the exact object of the amendment under consideration.

On May 24, 1897, \$50,000 was appropriated for the purchasing and furnishing of food, clothing, and medicines for destitute citizens of the United States in Cuba. That was an emergency. So is this.

By act of December 18, 1897, \$200,000 was appropriated for destitute persons in the mining regions of Alaska. That was for the relief of distress. It was not a "dole."

By the act of March 3, 1899, \$100,000 was appropriated for subsistence supplies to be issued to the destitute people of Cuba. That was not a "dole." Why should we not care for our own people as generously out of the Public Treasury?

By the act of May 13, 1902, Congress appropriated \$200,000 for destitute people of the French West Indies on account of the eruption of Mount Pelee. That was an act of humanity. That is exactly what we are trying to do through this legislation, to afford human relief to our own people.

We took care of the San Francisco earthquake and fire sufferers through an appropriation of \$2,500,000.

I do not criticize these appropriations, but am only attempting to draw a comparison.

We distributed provisions, clothing, medicines, and so forth, to the people of Jamaica through the act of January 18, 1907.

By the act of January 5, 1909, we appropriated \$800,000 for the suffering and destitute people of Italy, caused by the Messina earthquake. I submit that we should be as generous with the people of our own country who have suffered so terribly because of the drought and the business depression.

By the act of February 25, 1919, we appropriated \$100,000,000 as a revolving fund for furnishing food to the people of Europe. What we are trying to do through this legislation is to be as generous to our own people and as careful of their needs, and are trying to place in the hands of the President a fund of \$25,000,000, to be used in his judgment if other means of relief are found to be inadequate. Some of the Members of the House and Senate to-day voted for the act of February 25, 1919. Surely those who voted for that appropriation can not vote against this amendment.

By the act of December 22, 1921, an expenditure of \$20,000,000 was authorized from the funds of the United States Grain Corporation for the purchase of food for the people of Russia. Remember, this is a country that the Government of the United States does not recognize, and yet not only by this act but by the additional act of January 20, 1922, \$4,000,000 additional was appropriated for the transfer of surplus medical supplies to American organizations for Russian relief.

I am not criticizing these appropriations. I am inviting attention to them. Shall we extend relief to those in distress in foreign countries and then withhold it from those in our midst under the criticism that it is a "dole"?

By the act of February 24, 1925, a credit of \$6,017,069.03 in Army accounts was voted for the people of Japan. I am not criticizing that act, but we have sufferers in our own country we are seeking to relieve through the amendment under discussion.

By the act of December 21, 1928, \$6,000,000 was appropriated for agriculture and \$2,000,000 for schoolhouses and \$100,000 for seeds in Porto Rico because of the hurricane.

This was not a "dole," but was for human relief and for rehabilitation.

An additional appropriation was made on January 22, 1930, of \$2,000,000 for rebuilding of schools and \$1,000,000 for loans to coffee planters in Porto Rico.

The instances cited are only a few of the many placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1931, showing the appropriations made by Congress for the relief of humanity similar to the one involved in this amendment.

It is not my purpose to embarrass the Red Cross. If that organization is of the opinion that it can not accept an appropriation by Congress for the relief of suffering humanity, then in my judgment the amendment should be so changed as to place the responsibility upon the President of the United States and permit him to select his own agency to distribute it.

In our debt settlements with foreign countries, upon the pleas of their inability to meet their obligations, we remitted \$10,705,618,006.90.

We are in the midst of the worst business depression ever experienced in the history of our Nation. We have approximately 5,000,000 people unemployed, and have experienced the worst and most extensive drought this country has ever had, covering large areas in 21 States, yet when we attempt to make sure that adequate relief is to be extended to suffering humanity in our own country it is criticized as a "dole."

My preference was to increase the appropriation of \$45,000,000 to be loaned to farmers to purchase "seed, feed, and fertilizer," so as to include "food." If "food" had been included, and the amount increased to \$60,000,000, I do not believe there would have been any necessity for this amendment. We authorize loans to feed "work stock" and deny loans to purchase food for hungry children. We feed children in Europe but it is a "dole" to feed them at home. Experience has shown that a large percentage of such loans are repaid. The people throughout the country are in very great distress, but we have had no adequate survey made to show the number who may need relief. We are uncertain whether the Red Cross and other charitable organizations will be able to collect, through voluntary contributions, sufficient money to care for the situation. Being of this opinion, I am unwilling by my vote to permit Congress to adjourn without placing at the disposal of the President of the United States, to be used in his discretion, and through such agencies as he may select, a sum which will be adequate to meet any contingencies that may arise.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

MR. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT].

MR. FORT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, reference has been made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to the action of the Congress and the Government of the United States in the past in appropriating funds for the relief of distress in foreign nations. The fact remains, however, that in making those appropriations the principle was recognized and continued that the handling of moneys for the relief of necessity was a volunteer undertaking to be undertaken by those who, out of the charitable impulses of their hearts, desired so to do. Nor do they mention the fact that at that time it was impossible to raise the needed funds by private charity for foreign use. The gentlemen who now want to have the Government appropriate these funds have overlooked the fact that the Red Cross, under the administration of the present President of the United States, with voluntary contributions and volunteer service at the time of the Mississippi flood, handled an almost equally serious condition in the very territory from which the demand for relief now comes, and secured every dollar it sought from individual subscribers. The situation was handled without Government appropriation for relief, and was handled to the complete satisfaction of the neighborhood affected.

What is the real issue to-day? It is not the fear on the part of any man on either side of the aisle that all the money which may be needed will not be forthcoming from

the American people to relieve all distress which exists or may develop among American citizens.

It is therefore not a question of getting the funds; it is a question of the method by which the funds are to be raised. The question is simply whether we are going to rely upon the American people to take care of need by voluntary contribution according to the dictates of their hearts and their generous impulses, or whether we are going to substitute the method of raising charitable funds by the lash of the tax collector.

The Red Cross has never failed in its history to get every dollar it said it needed, and more. Why, when it is busily engaged in raising funds, should we put in its way the hurdle of political interference? There is not a Member on either side of this House who believes that funds are more wisely handled by poor and alms departments or by other Government agencies than by the Red Cross with its unflinching record of so handling moneys entrusted to it as not to offend the proud or reward the beggar. Are we to-day to say that the Red Cross can not get the money? Then we slur the emotions and the generosity of the American people. This may be said in some other legislative body, but the Members of the House of Representatives are the representatives of the people. [Applause.] Do we want to say that the people we represent will not come to the aid of fellow Americans in distress?

Do we want to raise as the standard to control the conduct of this Nation in every future catastrophe the idea that there will be no aid unless some Member arises on the floor here, and if he does not some Senator will at the other end of the Capitol, and introduce a bill for an appropriation. It will take but this one measure to establish a vicious precedent to destroy the morale of the superb Red Cross organization by tinging its unselfish volunteer service with the color of politics and the draft; to substitute the hard principle of the tax-raised dole for the fine and discriminating emotion of a generous people.

I say to this House with all solemnity, and I say it based on an effort two days this week to raise money for the Red Cross, that the very pendency of this legislation is the one threat to the securing of the funds. When this House has, to-day, as I hope and believe it will, emphatically told the people of the United States that we, the Representatives of those people, know that their hearts will produce all that is needed, the funds will roll in, in measure exceeding the need. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I believe the hearings yesterday before the Appropriations Committee demonstrated to the country for the first time that the Red Cross of America is giving no relief and intends to give no relief in the cities of this country. I am sure this position was not known by our people—that even the \$10,000,000 fund which is now being collected by the Red Cross will be used solely for the country districts and not one penny for relief in the cities.

For one, I am interested to learn this fact, and I think it will astound the people in the cities of the country to learn that in spite of the millions of dollars which they contribute annually to the Red Cross of this country none of that money is spent in the cities of the Nation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is being raised in the cities.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. It is being raised practically entirely in the cities, with the aid of the leading men of the cities, and I am also sure that these leading men of the cities, whose names have been mentioned on the floor to-day, themselves do not know that all the funds they are beseeching their neighbors to contribute will be entirely expended far from the homes of the contributors.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Would New York accept any of this money?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. New York, as a city, can take care of herself, but I am talking about the astounding disclosure that every charitable agency is giving relief in the city of New York except the Red Cross.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I want to know if New York would accept this money?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. New York City would not take the money as a municipality. The charitable organizations in New York City, except the Red Cross, are doing what they can to relieve the unprecedented situation.

Judge Payne yesterday stated—and I feel you want to be fair about this—that he was not opposed to such appropriations from the Government for relief. He was perfectly willing that the money be turned over to other agencies, but he upheld the President in refusing to agree that the Red Cross should handle it. It may be only incidental that the President of the United States, who is the honorary president of the Red Cross, appointed Judge Payne as active head of that organization.

Mr. CRAMTON. Judge Payne stated directly that it was his opinion that the appropriation would not only be destructive to the Red Cross but to other agencies doing relief work.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The judge never said anything of the kind as to other agencies. Of course, we have different interpretations upon recent reports and hearings. In the statement which the gentleman from Michigan inserted in the RECORD as to what Judge Payne held there was the complaint made that the Red Cross could not hand over the money to other agencies. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] remedies this defect and permits that to be done.

Why, the Red Cross has chapters in each and every city; the Red Cross expects and receives contributions from every city; the Red Cross has beautiful buildings in our cities, built entirely from contributions of the people of those cities; yet Judge Payne time and time again repeats, "We are not giving any relief in the cities and don't intend to."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that New York would much prefer to relieve unemployment, distress, and possible starvation from its own resources than to draw money from the Federal Treasury for that purpose?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. New York is not asking the Federal Treasury to contribute anything. The reason I am on my feet is to express my surprise at the frank attitude of the organization, which for a number of years has led people to believe it was interested in relief everywhere, that it is only concerned with suffering in the rural districts. Many of us have believed for years that its work extended to every hamlet and city throughout the world.

Mr. FORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes.

Mr. FORT. Is it a fact that the people of New York have raised \$8,000,000 that is being used by other agencies for this purpose?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes; through every agency I understand now except the Red Cross.

Recently one of the wealthiest citizens of Chicago left some hundreds of millions of dollars, and an ex-President of the United States and an ex-Governor of New York and other gentlemen were appointed trustees to allot the sum to various organizations throughout the country.

The Red Cross was included in the allotment, under the firm belief, I am sure, that the money would be used throughout our country and not merely in the rural sections.

Now, I do not know what the people of America will think about this belated admission of the Red Cross. Surely it must be a revelation to them when Judge Payne says that no help has been or will be given in any city in the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish, in the first place, to call attention to the

parliamentary situation. In the event that the motion proposed by the gentleman from Michigan prevails, this amendment, together with all of the others, will go to the Senate in disagreement. If the Senate does not recede, it will come back here again for an expression as to your further advice to the conferees. So, if there is anyone here who has any doubt, in the event that there is a disagreement, about having another vote, you can disabuse your mind of it.

It has been said here by the gentleman who just left the floor that the cities are getting no benefit from this relief, and that they should have a benefit.

I say to you that when Judge Payne was on the witness stand, and when he had been detailing how his agency was operating throughout the country, and how it had undertaken to care for the distressed in the drought regions throughout the country, I asked him the question as to what he meant by "country." He says, "I mean all those places that are not taken care of by the cities themselves." And he cited this notable example, to my very great surprise, that Birmingham, Ala., of all the cities of any consequence in the Nation, had not been taking care of its own. The Red Cross, finding that was true, went into Alabama and did the work so much needed there.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I just want to correct the gentleman's statement. The National Red Cross has not contributed as much as one penny to relief in Birmingham.

Mr. WOOD. The gentleman is mistaken. I do not yield any further.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. WOOD. I would rather take the word of Judge Payne—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But I have his word.

Mr. WOOD. No; the gentleman has not.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, yes; and I have it in writing, signed with his signature.

Mr. WOOD. Whether that be true or not, if Judge Payne was mistaken about it, yet Judge Payne says that they give relief wherever there is no other source of relief, and he says, with reference to going into these cities, that there has not been one single word come to the Red Cross organization but that the needs were being taken care of in all these cities. In New York City they have fifty-odd organizations giving help. It is taken care of in the city of Indianapolis. A business man was here the other day from that town and told me that by reason of their complete organization in the city of Indianapolis if there was anyone there who went hungry, it was his or her own fault, for there was ample provision to take care of them. I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that never since the sun began to shine was any country so blessed with an organization for the relief of distress as we are with the Red Cross [applause] and as has been said here, and I repeat it, are we to destroy this greatest agency that we have? We will not only destroy the Red Cross if we open up the coffers of the United States Treasury, because there will be no further contributions, but we will destroy others. It will destroy likewise the community chests in all the great centers of this country. The cities of this country are amply able and amply organized to take care of this distress. There is need of it in the country, because of the fact that there is no organization there, and in consequence this charitable organization, this agency of mercy, this agency whose only purpose is to relieve distress, goes everywhere, into every nook and cranny. They do not wait for a man who is hungry to go to them, because there are some men and women in this country who would starve rather than apply for charity. They hunt them up and they deliver the charity to them in such a way that they will not feel ashamed to accept it.

It has been said by those who have preceded me that Judge Payne testified and iterated and reiterated that they were able to take care of this problem even though it cost three times more than the highest estimate made by anyone. For 50 years and more they have met every emer-

gency they have been called upon to meet, in time of war and in time of peace. They have never failed. And to the credit of the American people who are the supporters of the Red Cross be it said that they have never failed to respond to a single appeal made by that organization. In this emergency, dire as it may be, shall we destroy not only the benefit of this institution for the emergency at present but for the ones that are to come? This is not the last emergency that we will have to meet; this is not the last disaster that will come upon our people. I think it is unfair upon the part of those that have been appealing to the Members of this House that this should be paid out of the Treasury, to refer to what has been done in respect to foreign countries. There are gentlemen here who are before me who were in Germany and Belgium and Russia during the trying days over there when we opened up our coffers, when we opened up our charity box, and sent money lavishly over there to relieve distress. Those people over there did not have a single cent; they did not have a single pound of meat; they did not have a single pound of flour. They had no organized government. That was quite a different question from what is presented to us by the State of Arkansas, which seems to be the worst of all States. There is organized government there. Everyone is in his own home. The State of Arkansas is doing now what every one of these States ought to do. The State of Oklahoma has already voted \$400,000 to take care of her own. The State of Arkansas in the lower branch of her legislature has passed a resolution appropriating \$15,000,000 to take care of her own. [Applause.] That is what every one of these States ought to do. I would hate to think that the credit of Oklahoma, the credit of Kentucky, the credit of Arkansas, or the credit of any of these States has been ruined, and it is to the credit of these people that they are now taking such steps as may be necessary to take care of their own.

I call attention now to what has been said by somebody here that no attempt has ever been made by this Congress to appropriate money for this purpose. It was made. It was made during the administration of Grover Cleveland for the purpose of aiding distress in the State of Texas, and I call attention to what he said in vetoing the bill:

The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood.

That is the spirit that we ought to exercise here to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. No; I have not the time. There is just one thing more I want to call attention to. Judge Payne thinks that an attempt of the character that is proposed by these amendments is paralyzing the Red Cross.

I want to call attention to this. Mr. BACON asked him:

Mr. Payne, the Red Cross has never yet failed in the half century of its history?

Mr. PAYNE. Never.

Mr. BACON. And if Congress does not interfere too much, it is not going to fail now?

Mr. PAYNE. Absolutely not. All we pray is that you let us alone and let us do the job, and if we do not do it, kick us.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield that I may offer an amendment as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman can do it in his own time.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS: Page 129, line 18, after the word "the," strike out the remainder of the line and the words "American Red Cross," in line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Distributed by the President of the United States in his discretion to national, charitable, welfare, fraternal, or religious organizations in amounts equal to the amount raised and expended by such organization."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, personally I would rather vote for an outright appropriation, but I want to give my colleagues on the Republican side of the House an opportunity to vote for something. I want to see my side of the aisle do something in this crisis besides voting no.

There is no logic in the argument and there is no justification for the cry that has been raised that private charity and Government aid are inconsistent. The two are parallel, and have been cooperating and coordinating within the United States, the State governments, and in every city in this country for many, many years. There are private hospitals and municipal hospitals in every city of the United States. There are private recreation centers and public recreation centers—one maintained by public funds, the other supported by private charities. Privately maintained health centers do not conflict with municipal or State health centers. Municipal milk stations do not prevent private charity from contributing to their own milk stations. There is not a social or welfare work that is not so paralleled. That is simply an alibi to justify a refusal to meet actual conditions.

Gentlemen, you may vote down this amendment, you may even vote it down when it comes back from conference, but just as sure as you are sitting here to-day, we will be here in the hot months of the summer appropriating a much larger amount for this very purpose.

There is destitution all over the country. The Government must provide relief.

I have always had a very high regard for the Red Cross. They have rendered signal services in the past. I admired their great work during the war. The American Red Cross is an American institution belonging to all the American people and not to the central committee. I went into the committee the other day when I heard the chairman of the Red Cross was to testify. I wanted to hear the representative of this great humanitarian organization. I entered that room almost with reverence, and instead of hearing a Samaritan I found a statistician. You can not treat this subject of human distress as you treat cold statistics. The Census Bureau now indicates that there are over 5,000,000 unemployed persons in this country, which means from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 people in need. There are from three to four dependents on each unemployed. Gentlemen, do you realize what that means? Twenty million people in need, and some would treat the problem as cold statistics. Gentlemen stand here and talk about State rights, and the great alleged spokesman of the White House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT], comes here and tells us just what we must do.

Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey, who is close to the White House and who, some people believe, speaks for the White House, that whoever is advising the President had better advise him on the real conditions of the country and invoke some of that great human heart that the people of America believe that Herbert Hoover has. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] quoted President Cleveland, that suffering and distress made men sturdy and therefore created a better brotherhood of men. Let me refer the gentleman from Indiana to a higher authority. I ask the gentleman from Indiana to read St. Luke, tenth chapter, twenty-fifth verse, and learn there the story of the Samaritan. Does the gentleman from Indiana remember when the mean little politician, the smart lawyer, endeavored to embarrass Jesus Christ?

Does not the gentleman remember how the lawyer tried to make fine distinctions and arguments against the teachings of the Master?

Christ had been preaching brotherly love, and the lawyer tried to embarrass him with trick questions. Very similar to

the distinction being made to-day between private charity and Government aid. The questions remind one of constitutional arguments urged against the Government aiding the needy in the midst of a national crisis. Let me quote from the twenty-fifth verse of the tenth chapter of St. Luke:

And behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And He answering said, "Thou shalt love * * * thy neighbor as thyself."

And the lawyer then asked, "Who is my neighbor?" And Jesus, answering, said: "A man was once going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, when he fell into the hands of robbers, who stripped him of everything and beat him and went away, leaving him half dead. As it chanced, a priest was going down by that road. He saw the man, but passed by on the opposite side. A Levite, too, did the same; he came up to the spot but, when he saw the man, passed by on the opposite side. But a Samaritan, traveling that way, came upon the man, and, when he saw him, he was moved with compassion. He went to him and bound up his wounds, dressing them with oil and wine, and then put him on his own mule and brought him to an inn and took care of him. The next day he took out 4 shillings and gave them to the innkeeper. 'Take care of him,' he said, 'and whatever more you may spend I will myself repay you on my way back.'"

"Now which do you think of these three men," asked Jesus, "proved himself a neighbor to the man who fell into robbers' hands?"

"The one that took pity on him," was the answer; on which Jesus said, "Go and do the same yourself."

That is all my amendment does; it provides that "we do so ourselves." Let the American Red Cross and other organizations continue raising funds and carrying on the good work. Let the Government do likewise. Why should not the Government do something to help in this period of distress?

Why should we hesitate? I have listed here 93 instances where Congress appropriated money for direct relief, starting in 1803 and continuing down to 1930. I will not encumber the RECORD with this list now because I put it in the hearing before the Committee on Agriculture the other day. There are 93 separate instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York two additional minutes, without any indorsement of his position.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] could only express himself as he feels down in the bottom of his heart, he would be appropriating sufficient funds to take care of all the destitute people of this country. [Applause.]

The Red Cross stated they would do nothing in the cities. Why not? If the Red Cross, or any organization, can choose where they will operate—all the more reason for appropriations to help everywhere.

All we hear is charity, charity, charity. Is there no such thing as a right to assistance? If charity is to do all—charity can elect whom they shall help. How about that? If educational institutions are to be supported by charity, and needy people dependent entirely on private charity and infant care at the mercy of charity, will not the people controlling these charities not very soon have greater powers than the Government? Are destitute Americans, self-respecting Americans, willing workers, to beg on bended knees for charity in this critical hour of need? I say this condition has gotten beyond charity, and the Government must step in. I say if you do not provide funds to-day, you will do it at a later day. Money and more money is needed to supplement all that the Red Cross and other organizations now have to give relief all over this country where it is needed. If my city does not need any relief, so much the better; there will be so much more for other cities. But I say my city does need relief. They are doing what they can. There are hundreds of thousands of unemployed. They do not have homes. They are tenants. They do not have food,

They do not have the facilities that people in the country have. They must have help. We are making a mistake in trying to draw these fine distinctions at this time, when here are 93 instances where Congress has appropriated money.

I hope that one of the constructive, real, amendments will be approved to-day; and I hope the Republicans will stop this negative attitude of opposing every constructive suggestion that is made to bring relief to the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we witnessed a spectacle here a few minutes ago that was rather unpleasant. We heard the distinguished gentleman from New York City [Mr. O'CONNOR] indulge in a vigorous and vitriolic attack against the Red Cross, and he made the charge—

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I do not yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I did not.

Mr. REED of New York. He made the charge that the Red Cross was not helping in the cities, and that he was amazed, shocked, and surprised. There is not a person on this floor or in the galleries who does not know that in every great disaster in the cities the Red Cross has been the first organization on the job. [Applause.] You can take the city of Galveston at the time of the flood; you can take Dayton; you can take Johnstown; you can take San Francisco at the time of the earthquake, and all along the line, and the Red Cross train started from the East within 48 hours with supplies to remedy the situation in those cities. Why did the Red Cross go in? Because society was temporarily disorganized, and I say to the gentleman from New York that if the old earth were to give one little shiver and an earthquake should shake New York City there would be a response from all over this Nation that would supply them with ample funds to feed and clothe the people of that city and rebuild the city of New York, if necessary. [Applause.]

I have been rather interested to hear some of the remarks on this side of the House. It so happens that in 1917 the great war President, Woodrow Wilson, who had the confidence and respect of the people of the United States, set aside the week of June 18 to 25 to raise the largest sum that had ever been raised at one time for relief in the history of the world—\$100,000,000. At that very time the same argument was being made and being sent in by men large and small from every part of the United States of America, saying, "Let the United States do it. Let the Government do it. Why not distribute this load equally and equitably all over the country?" They lost sight of one of the big factors of civilization, and President Wilson was too wise, was too well read in history, and understood psychology too well to be fooled by that specious plea.

He appointed a group of prominent men, among whom was Mr. Henry Davison, of the House of Morgan, to formulate a plan for that great drive. With all modesty, I played a small part in that drive. I had charge of eight States in that campaign to raise \$100,000,000. Let me show you what it means to have a Red Cross organization. There was a certain amount of resistance in that campaign. There were people who said they were too busy and that they could not afford to give, but when the great sales force, composed of thousands and thousands of big-hearted, red-blooded people, went out and talked to their neighbors in terms of the Good Samaritan, what happened? Why, chapters sprung up all over the country. They increased from 500 chapters to over 2,000. They were all active, and in one week the people of this country had responded and we had raised over \$100,000,000. No one can ever calculate the value of that work.

Some talk about turning the relief money over to the Legion. How many members do you think the Red Cross had at the end of the war? There were over 20,000,000

members of the Red Cross organization walking the streets. They were working and doing relief work.

Later, my friends, I was over across the sea. I visited many of the 50 Red Cross hospitals. Fifty units had been established over there, each one with a capacity of 500 beds. I saw many of the 32,000 Red Cross nurses. I saw the Red Cross nurses in the operating rooms where the blood was above the soles of their shoes. I saw the Red Cross nurse go and kneel down in blood beside the dying boy, caress him and kiss him good-bye as he passed away. No organization in the history of the world has carried mercy everywhere like the Red Cross. [Applause.] Woodrow Wilson knew that if Congress had appropriated funds then it would have killed that angel of mercy, and if you appropriate this money now you will kill this angel of mercy. Gentlemen, every man who votes this fund will raise the hand of the assassin against the greatest mother the world has ever known. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKEOWN moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 144 with the following amendment: Page 129, line 16, strike out all of line 16 to and including line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available, to be placed to the credit of the War Department for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, by advancing to community charitable organizations of reputable standing, willing and able to distribute to those who are needy, such food, medicine, and other articles essential to afford adequate human relief, and to advance upon open account necessary food, medicine, or other articles essential to afford human relief to such citizens as shall be indorsed as honorable persons by any reputable charitable organization, approved by the War Department."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, no encomium you may pay the Red Cross and no applause you may give in this House is going to feed the hungry people of this country. If the Red Cross is dead or is killed, I will tell you the gentleman who killed Cock Robin. It was Mr. John Barton Payne. The Red Cross is not dead; but if it be dying, he is the man who struck the fatal blow.

Yes; President Wilson did go out and raise \$100,000,000 for the Red Cross to take care of America, and men in this House here to-day who are going to vote against this \$25,000,000 turned around and voted to loan and give \$100,000,000 to the peoples of the Near East. If you can answer to your people as to why you voted \$100,000,000 for the Near East and refused to give \$25,000,000 to your own people, then go home and answer to your own constituents. You voted \$20,000,000 to the Russians. Can you go home and look your constituents in the face and say that you were not willing to take \$25,000,000 out of the Treasury for our own country, but I was willing to vote to take \$20,000,000 out of the Treasury for Russia. Now, some big business men are trying to close the doors of trade with Russia by embargoes.

You gave the Chinese \$18,000,000 to keep peace in China; not to feed them, but to keep peace there, and then you refuse to give your own people \$25,000,000. Bill after bill has been offered in this House to feed starving Chinese.

I am not here to chide you. That is not my business. I am calling this to your attention, and if you adopt my amendment, you turn this fund into the War Department and you will stop the dead-beats in this country.

There are a lot of dead-beats that are hanging around these places to get a hand-out, who do not work when there are opportunities to work; but I want to give the honest, hard-working man who is out of a job an opportunity so that he can get the indorsement of his local committee that he is a trust-worthy person, and then get some groceries on credit or on an open account. If you do this you are going

to save some of the morale of some of the good men in this country who are to-day temporarily embarrassed, and you will give the food to the ones who need it. Your local associations will give help to the people who really need it and give a man a chance to have some credit instead of making this a dole to him. Let him go to his local association and make his needs known and if he is worthy he will be recommended as an honorable person, and if there is any patriotism left in this country he will pay that grocery bill whenever he gets a job. I am willing to trust the honest, hard-working men of this country who are temporarily out of jobs. I will take their word of honor that they will pay this debt back, and you can sell these supplies to them at the same rate that their local merchants charge and in this way you do not cause any undue hardship upon them.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I yield.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I partially represent a city that has a population of 3,250,000 and there has not been one request from that city for me to support this \$25,000,000 appropriation, not one.

Mr. McKEOWN. No, sir; because—

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Because we are able to take care of our own poor and we are taking care of them.

Mr. McKEOWN. No; that is not the reason. The poor only appeal to those who are sympathetic to the poor. They do not appeal to people who have no sympathy for them, and the reason this Government is standing to-day is because—

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I can not yield further.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that I will contribute as much to the Red Cross as the gentleman will, and I have been contributing to the Red Cross.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to say the reason this Government is standing now in this hour of crisis is because the poor, the unfortunate, and the needy people of this country know that there are men in Congress who are trying to do what they can to ameliorate their conditions. This is the reason they are standing by their Government, otherwise you would have a flame of fire that would bring a revolution in this country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise principally for the purpose of denying with all the emphasis of which I am capable that Members of this body who support this appropriation are assassins of the Red Cross. We know what the record of the Red Cross has been. No private organization for the relief of distress in all the centuries has equaled the record of this organization [applause], and we all know it. I am supporting the preferential motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] because it appears to me it solves completely this question. It gets us out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves now, and it enables the Red Cross to escape from the unfortunate position it occupies at the present time.

The preferential motion of the gentleman from Colorado is simply this: It provides that this fund of \$25,000,000 shall be expended under the direction of the President of the United States and such agencies as he may select.

In this connection who is the President of the United States? The President of the United States is also the president of the Red Cross organization. He can distribute this fund through his own organization in spite of anything Judge Payne may say about it, or in spite of anything his advisory committee may say, and through any other organization he may select.

Since the morning stars sang together this world has produced no man who has distributed more in charity than the President of the United States. [Applause.] And it has

been intelligently distributed and distributed with a minimum of expense. Talk about the President being opposed to this \$25,000,000 appropriation! Let me read to you from his own testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives 11 years ago this month. We intrusted to Mr. Hoover, then Food Administrator, the expenditure of the largest amount of money ever expended in the history of the world for the relief of the destitute.

Mr. TREADWAY asked this question of Mr. Hoover in January, 1920:

I just wanted to get it clear in my own mind—if the chairman is willing—on that point. You say out of the \$10,000,000,000, \$2,000,000,000 practically was used for food purposes; is that correct?

Mr. HOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. COPLEY. Purchases were made here?

Mr. HOOPER. Yes. Then beyond the direct Treasury advances there was the \$100,000,000 appropriation by Congress for the relief of other areas that could not be met by Treasury loans. That was originally expected, I think, to be largely given away, but a very large portion of it is recoverable, I am sure.

Mr. HOOPER. * * * The \$100,000,000 was, except for approximately \$12,000,000 which went in sheer charity—and sheer charity simply—to undernourished and derelict children—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. And that fund was expended, the \$2,000,000,000, just as Herbert Hoover wanted to spend it. He administered it all.

Now this trivial fund proposed under this bill is \$25,000,000, and he can spend it just as he pleases, if the preferential motion prevails.

If the Red Cross drive succeeds in raising enough money, then President of the Red Cross Hoover, in that capacity, need not expend this fund. If it is necessary to expend some part of it he can do it.

Are you Republican Members afraid to trust your own President to do that? I am willing to trust him. Every Democrat on this side of the House is willing to trust him. But the speeches so far made in opposition to this proposition come from you gentlemen, who are supposed to uphold the hands of the President of the United States.

Has the Red Cross organization ceased to function? Up to the present hour, according to the information just received on the floor the drive of the Red Cross for funds is proceeding. It has not stopped. They are still getting money. At the present moment it has hardly started, but they have accumulated over \$4,000,000 out of the \$10,000,000 they started out to get.

We are not assassinating the Red Cross by these measures, we are helping the Red Cross.

When did public charity and private charity cease to go along hand in hand? They always have through all the history of modern States. Assassinate the Red Cross because we are appropriating money for private relief? Why, during the war the Red Cross did function on every battle front in Europe and in every distressed country; it functioned while we were distributing this immense amount of money, and it helped Mr. Hoover to distribute the funds.

Now, I have not related all the accomplishments of Mr. Hoover in distributing food relief. Let me read some more of his testimony at that time. Let me read from his own testimony so that no man here will get up and deny it.

I read now from what Mr. Hoover said:

In the case of Poland we had at one time, and have to-day, for that matter, 1,200,000 children being fed in this manner. We calculated the cost at about \$1 per child per month for imports, and the internal costs are approximately the same amount.

He went on then to say that out of \$100,000,000 appropriated in addition to this \$2,000,000,000, he distributed \$12,000,000 of that amount, funds appropriated by this Congress, for the relief of the starving children of Poland. But that was not all that Herbert Hoover did during the war in the matter of food relief. I quote now from his own testimony:

The British Government made an appropriation of £12,500,000, expended under my coordination, and for which they also recovered obligations of the different governments. No part of that fund was used, so far as I remember, for child feeding.

The British Government had at that time so much confidence in the ability of the man you now denounce and refuse to support that it turned over to him nearly \$70,000,000 of its own funds and he distributed that acting in the capacity of an official of the United States Government.

I have not enumerated all of the funds controlled by Herbert Hoover at that critical period in the history of the world and distributed by him for human relief effectively and economically. I can not refrain from calling attention to the fact that at the close of the war Austria found herself in dire distress. On the initiative of Herbert Hoover and at his suggestion we turned over to Austria \$25,000,000 worth of winter-wheat flour, accepting in return the bonds of Austria, at that time considered worthless. Within the last two years Austria has made an economic recovery sufficient to give these bonds a value. Whereupon, at the request and at the suggestion of New York bankers, we subordinated them to a loan of over \$100,000,000, to be floated principally in this country by certain New York bankers, and this action was approved by President Hoover. We are therefore now in a position of having as a result of his initiative given to Austria a sum of money in excess of \$30,000,000. We will never get it back.

I might mention that other war-torn nations in Europe contributed to the fund we provided for civilian relief so expended under the direction of Herbert Hoover. No man who ever lived in the world has had equal opportunities to familiarize himself with economical and effective methods of distributing relief, and no man has ever exceeded the record he made.

I might mention that the \$2,000,000,000 distributed by Herbert Hoover for civilian relief has never been paid back to the Government of the United States. It was included as a part of the \$10,000,000,000 for which we accepted the agreements of our debtor nations to pay us approximately 50 per cent, and we gave them 62 years to do it. In other words, half of the \$2,000,000,000 we gave out of our Treasury for the relief of the distress in alien nations across the seas, and this immense sum does not include the relief we extended through our grain corporation, that distribution he also superintended.

Some Member of this House ought to speak for the President—I do not do it. There was a time when I frequently arose in my place on this floor and defended Herbert Hoover in his administration of food relief against the attacks which came always from the Republican side of this House, in the dark days of the war, and I find myself now defending President Hoover against the attitude taken now by the Republican side of this House—over a decade after the war.

There seems to be a sort of a "grape vine" leadership on the Republican side of this House, which no man understands. The attitude of you gentlemen on the Republican side seems to be distinctly in opposition to the proposition I am supporting. Are you acting, any of you, at the command of the President in assuming the attitudes you assume? I am unwilling to believe it. The immense sums for relief in other lands to which I have been calling attention were appropriated and expended on the initiative and through the agency of Herbert Hoover. Can anybody say, on this floor, that during the days of the war and just after the war he was willing and anxious to take money from the Treasury of the United States and distribute it for relief purposes in European nations?

And can you say that he is not willing now to take money appropriated in the same way from the Treasury of the United States for the relief of distress in our own country? If you are representing the President in the position you take here the situation which presents itself is strange, indeed. I am willing to trust the President. Are you, gentlemen, on the other side of this aisle? I trusted him and defended him during the days of the World War, and I am trusting him

now. You gentlemen are on ground which you can not defend if you occupy a position antagonistic to that contemplated in the preferential motion I am supporting.

The present Republican administration, under the leadership of President Hoover, so far has not been a conspicuous success. Let us give him a job he can do. You Republicans ought to be willing to do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST].

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, I rise for the purpose of trying to explain to some of the gentlemen of this House how we take care of the poor and needy in the city of Chicago, in the hope that it might be beneficial to them and that they may apply the same principles at home. I heard my friend Mr. SPROUL, the gentleman from Illinois, a while ago accused of not being sympathetic because he was not one of the poor people. God knows that I can not have the same accusation made against me. I come from the poorest of the poor. My mother and father were slaves in the territory that some gentlemen here control—Alabama—so that I sympathize with the downtrodden and the underprivileged people. In our great city of Chicago, realizing the fact that we would have depression and unemployment, in the district I represent, the first district of Illinois, we organized a charity organization before I came to Congress to take care of the very emergency now existing. When I went home at Christmas week we gave away 3,000 baskets to the poor families out of the money raised by that organization.

On the 27th day of December we organized an eating house at 3140 Indiana Avenue, Chicago, and we started in and gave those who applied coffee and bread early in the morning. After that we served one regular meal to everybody who came, white and black alike. I received a letter from my office in Chicago this morning telling me that they had served over 65,000 meals to those who need them. Our friend Mr. LA GUARDIA this morning quoted from the Scriptures, justifying his attitude. Well, at some place in the Good Book it is said that we should do unto our neighbors as we would that they should do unto us, and I am trying to live up to that and not asking for public funds to make mendicants out of the American people. [Applause.] And I represent more poor people than any other man in America represents. I am against the establishment of the dole system in America. [Applause.] I would be against voting for this bill if it were going to send money to the city of Chicago or any other large city that is able to take care of its own people. In the city of Chicago we have an organization of the people to do that very thing, and the people of every city in America should have organizations to take care of the down-and-out people, the underprivileged, the unemployed. I have heard gentlemen on this floor many times claim that they believe in State rights. Well, if we believe in State rights, we should give the people of the States the right to take care of their own. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS].

Mr. ADKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as part of my remarks a story from a newspaper published in Champaign, Ill., that tells about the community chest there, and the portion they were assessed by the Red Cross amounting to \$1,750 for drought relief. I think that was the first that was paid in the United States. They did that unknown to me. They did not appeal to me to have the Government do it. I did not know anything about it until I read the account of it in this newspaper article. The point I want to make is that they are taking care of their own, and they are in distress out there, because it is a farming district and they are as hard up as anybody, but they are taking care of their own poor. Other counties out there are hard hit, but they are meeting their local and outside obligations. This appropri-

tion, if made, would be just another local obligation transferred to the National Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

LOCAL DROUGHT-RELIEF QUOTA OF \$1,750 PAID FROM CHEST SURPLUS—
CHAMPAIGN-URBANA AMONG FIRST AREAS IN UNITED STATES TO PAY IN
RED CROSS \$10,000,000 DRIVE

Champaign-Urbana gained the honor of being among the very first—if not the first—of communities in the United States Saturday to pay its entire quota to the Red Cross drought-relief fund when the executive committee of the community chest authorized checks totaling \$1,750 to be paid the Champaign County Chapter of the Red Cross. The money was from the surplus resulting from oversubscription in the community-chest campaign which ended November 24.

"Champaign-Urbana, due to the generosity of this community in oversubscribing its community-chest campaign the past year, is enabled to meet an emergency such as its quota in the \$10,000,000 Red Cross drought-relief campaign without subjecting its people to another campaign for funds," C. A. Petry, general chairman of the community-chest campaign of 1930, declared Saturday.

"When the Champaign County Chapter of the American Red Cross was advised by their national headquarters that their quota in the drought-relief campaign had been fixed at \$3,000, they proceeded to establish quotas for Champaign-Urbana and the remainder of the county. They started immediately to organize for a drive for these funds.

"The quota set for Champaign-Urbana was \$1,750. When this matter came to the attention of the community-chest executive committee, it was suggested by Harry J. Millard that the oversubscription of the last chest campaign could well be used for this purpose."

The executive committee was canvassed and voted unanimously to allot \$1,750 of the chest's oversubscription to the Red Cross, Petry explained.

H. A. Amerman, president of the community chest, announced Saturday night that the check for the above amount had been issued Saturday afternoon to the Red Cross organization.

One check, he explained, was made out to Judge Franklin H. Boggs for the Urbana quota, and the other to E. S. Swigart for the Champaign quota.

"This will undoubtedly make Champaign-Urbana one of the first communities, if not the first, to subscribe its complete quota," Petry said.

"This is just another instance of the benefit of a community chest to the community. That the citizens fully appreciate the chest and their obligation to it is evidenced by the large number of subscriptions received since the chest campaign was closed."

Mr. Petry stated that not a week has passed since the campaign closed without his receiving one or more new pledges through the mail.

"I want people to understand that these pledges are appreciated as much as the ones made during the time the campaign was put on. The money subscribed to the chest later will be used solely for the welfare and charitable organizations of this community."

Members of the executive committee of the board of trustees which allowed the \$1,750 payment were Howard Ammerman, president; Joe Williamson, secretary; Harry Millard, Charles Pearson, J. B. Prettyman, L. B. King, George Chapin, C. A. Petry.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by several speakers to-day concerning the Russian relief have brought me to my feet. I should like to make three points in two minutes, consequently I can not be interrupted. In the first place the Russian relief bill did not appropriate any money out of the Treasury of the United States. It authorized the expenditure of funds of the United States Grain Corporation to the amount of \$20,000,000 in famine-stricken Russia, and this amount was taken out of the profits made by the United States Grain Corporation on sales made in other European countries. In the second place, with regard to the conditions in Russia, they were brought about very largely by the Russian Soviet Government which had been taking from the farmers the grain that they grew, except enough to feed their own families, and distributing it according to their socialistic plan. The farmers then began to cut down the area they were planting, counting on growing enough only for themselves. Then came the drought which continued through three horrible years. The conditions were quite different, and the results anticipated were very different. I have been told that the expenditure of that money actually saved from starvation about 8,000,000 people

who otherwise would have died. Something like an attack has been made on that expenditure. I was the author of that bill, I made the report upon it, and I had charge of it when it passed the House.

I still think it was the right thing to do, and it needs no defence to-day.

The results in this country would be quite different, it seems to me. There was no danger whatever that an appropriation for the famine sufferers in Russia would train them to depend on like appropriations in the future, nor would generous people in this country, whether rich or of moderate means, who have supported the Red Cross and local charities, be taught to look in the future to like appropriations to relieve them of their responsibilities. The Speaker's gavel has fallen and I do not have time to develop this point as I had hoped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, it has been said by my colleagues this means the life or death of the Red Cross or the destruction of it. That does not rise to the dignity of an argument or a reason. It is just camouflage. As a matter of fact, we on this side are just as loyal to the Red Cross as you on your side.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. Does the gentleman believe the statement of Mr. Payne, who is chairman of the Red Cross, and has been for 12 years?

Mr. FULLER. What was his statement?

Mr. DICKINSON. His statement was that it would be the worst blow that could be struck at the American Red Cross in its entire history.

Mr. FULLER. I do not believe it; that is just an expression of his opinion.

They say they are ready and able to take care of the situation. Let us see whether they are able to take care of the situation. Chairman Payne, of the Red Cross, said this was the "greatest peace-time emergency in the history of this country." There is great distress in America, the richest nation in the world; yet when we come to the State from which I hail, Mr. Payne says they are now feeding 550,000 people daily, over one-fourth the population of the State. How are they feeding them? For a family of five they are giving them \$2.50 a week, or 2 cents a meal. Nobody in the world can live on such rations as that.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. No. I can not yield, but if the gentleman will give me time within which to answer his question I will yield for any question he wants to ask.

Your colleague from Chicago [Mr. DE PRIEST] told us about how they took care of them in the cities. We do the same in Arkansas. Nobody wants any money to feed the poor who live in the cities in the State of Arkansas, in any great amount; but it is the poor farmer and the tenant farmer for whom we ask aid. There are 250,000 colored men in our State who, if they are not given more aid than they are being given now, will die of hunger or contract pellagra and go to an early grave. You are not even taking care of the feeding of the milk cows from which we get milk to take care of babies. You take care of the jackasses and you loan money to buy feed for them in order that we can cultivate a crop, but you do nothing to take care of the individual.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I do not yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] has used his time and he has no right to interrupt when the gentleman does not yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. I asked the gentleman if he would yield.

Mr. FULLER. I do not yield. I have said that two or three times. I have not the time.

This resolution only provides to turn this money over to the President to use at his discretion. If he does not need to expend it he will not do so. It has been the history of this country, as is shown here to-day, that we have appropriated millions upon millions of dollars for the poor, hungry, and destitute of Europe, but not a dime do you want to give to the distressed and hungry of America. [Applause.]

The leaders of the Red Cross have stated that they are not used to this kind of an emergency, they have confined their activities to the cities and towns and disasters such as floods, cyclones, and so forth, where their activities are more or less centralized. While they are doing the very best they can, and we have no criticism to offer, still, if they are able, they have yet to relieve the distress. We feel sure and know they will do all within their power. One-fourth of the population of my State is living off of charity and, after all, we are not much worse off than those in Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, and parts of other States in the drought area.

There is so much red tape connected with the emergency relief in the borrowing of money that the relief will not be as great as at first contemplated.

School children, not only in my State but in the various drought-stricken regions of this Nation, are being fed soup and other nourishment at the various schoolhouses.

In 1927 and 1928 we had a flood in Arkansas; in 1929 we had a drought, but made no complaint and even did not ask to be included in the States to which drought relief was extended, but in 1930 we had a drought such as we had never known before, and being confronted not only with the panicky conditions existing all over the country but with local conditions.

The merchants were forced into bankruptcy, 125 banks out of 400 in our State have closed their doors, being about the same percentage that has occurred in other sections of this drought area extending to 21 States. Farmers who were well to do are no longer able to buy from the merchant nor borrow money from his local bank; poor farmers and tenants are in much worse condition, and we are certainly entitled to relief.

It is contended it is bad policy for this Government to appropriate money for charity. Being the richest nation in the world, it is never bad policy for this Government to furnish food for its starving citizens nor raiment for those in dire need and distress. No one can truthfully say that our actions constitute a raid upon the Treasury nor the playing of politics at the expense of human misery, such as suggested by our President. Even if it were poor policy, it would be much better to adopt the same, saving the hungry and distressed, than to refuse to give aid and assistance.

It might just as well be contended that it is bad policy for a government to be so administered that failures and panics appear upon every hand. In the last 12 months panic upon panic has occurred on Wall Street and every section of this country; bread and soup lines are formed daily in the large cities; unemployment exists in the millions as never before in the history of this Nation; bank failures are seen upon every hand; suffering and starvation exists not only in the drought region but all over America; and veterans who have gone out and fought our battles and won our victories are seen tramping to Washington, seeking aid and assistance; those who are asking for bread are given a stone; conditions are such in this Nation to-day that the World War veterans are borrowing on their compensation certificates \$1,000,000 daily—five times greater than before this panic. No doubt those who are opposing this appropriation do not want it to go down in history that these things occurred during this administration, especially in view of the fact that their campaign of prosperity and a full dinner pail has been answered by the cries and tears of hungry women and children and the demand of honest labor for employment.

You may call it a "dole" if you will, but if it is a "dole" this Government has been pursuing such a policy since 1803.

In the neighborhood of a hundred instances have been referred to on the floor of the House to-day, as the RECORD will reflect, where this Nation has given relief to the American distressed by large appropriations. This Government has appropriated \$100,000,000 to the starving and hungry of Europe on one occasion, \$20,000,000 on another occasion to starving Russia, and on other occasions too numerous to mention. It was then quite satisfactory to President Hoover, who was then Food Administrator, but it is not satisfactory to him now when this kind of distress and relief comes under his administration. At that time he was known as the great humanitarian, and upon that propaganda and the fact that he stood for the poor and distressed he went before the American electorate; now we see that his attitude has changed, and his followers in this House are desirous that future history will not show that this Government during his reign appropriated money to feed the poor and hungry. We wonder how this administration and its followers will account to the unemployed and distressed of this Nation when they seek to avoid the responsibility and shift it to the American Red Cross. It is to be hoped that this great organization raises the \$10,000,000, as I believe it will, but if it does accomplish this great task it will not be a start to take care of the relief needed. In the drought-stricken areas it will be near June before they will be able to raise anything to relieve their hunger, and it is not until crops are gathered in the fall that they will be able to buy raiment, and then the first thing they must do is to pay back to this Government the money they have borrowed as a first mortgage upon their crops, for which they purchased seed and feed for their work stock.

This Government is wealthy enough that it can afford to break a precedent where the welfare and health of its citizenship is at stake. One would think that this administration was embarrassed financially; but we find that, according to their program, \$300,000,000 is to be spent in the city of Washington this year in the way of public improvements; \$30,000,000 is to be spent for building battleships in times of peace; \$40,000,000 to be used to pay retirement each year hereafter for the civil-service employees due to the administration's policy of taking care of the high-paid employees of this organization; and on every hand we see appropriations upon appropriations, mounting into the millions, that could have been postponed to help the general welfare of the Nation. The time is coming in the near future when those who fail to support this measure will have to account to the American people for their lack of kindness and sympathy. In my opinion, God and an indignant American citizenship will condemn public officials and the administration that has brought about and has utterly failed to take care of the unemployed, ragged, hungry, and distressed people of this Nation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself eight minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, since I have a long speech to make in eight minutes, I will request that I be not asked to yield.

POLITICS AND THE RED CROSS

I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have heard more compliments if not the only compliment given the President of the United States from the Democratic side of the House to-day than I have heard before in three or four years. [Applause.] You are just running over with willingness to trust the President when, on the \$116,000,000 bill, the leaders of your party in Senate and House were reluctant to even let him allocate the funds for Government construction. And, Mr. Speaker, I will go into this just a little more. A day or two ago a leader in the movement for this appropriation, in a legislative body which may not be referred to by name under our rules, said, "The Red Cross is now the political screen behind which the President of the United States is undertaking to shirk his responsibility to see that those who are suffering and starving in this country are relieved." There is a direct attack upon the President, a direct attack upon the central committee of the Red Cross,

a direct charge that in opposing this Government grant to the Red Cross the President and the Red Cross heads are actuated by political motives. That hasty declaration by a noted and honored citizen of Arkansas leaves a suspicion that there might even be some partisanship in the insistence of that speaker and others, not that destitution be relieved, but that the President and the Red Cross do it in the very way, and only in the very way, he and others suggest.

Referring to the declaration of the committee that the Red Cross could not accept a Federal appropriation, this was the attack:

Mr. President, this is a declaration of what a great number of us have suspected—that the Red Cross has ceased to be an independent organization, controlled and dedicated to the relief of human suffering everywhere, but is now the political screen behind which the President of the United States is undertaking to shirk his responsibility to see that those who are suffering and the starving in this country are relieved.

It would be so much more manly, Mr. President, for the President himself to say it than for political reasons, to drag down, as he has done and is doing, this organization, to which millions of people contribute every year, an organization founded by a woman whose memory is to be sacred to humanity-loving people always, and make of it an instrumentality of oppression, of denying relief to the hungry and starving.

I protest against such action, Mr. President. If the President himself wants to become the stark, naked oppressor of humanity, let him do it in his own name and not degrade this institution which is known as the Red Cross.

That is a more frank statement of the sentiment of some toward the Red Cross and the President than we have heard here to-day. Which statement—that which praises or that which condemns the acts and the motives of the President and the Red Cross—represents the real sentiment of the Democratic Party?

The National Red Cross is a nonpolitical organization, if you please. Those who charge that Judge Payne's position and the position of the central committee is political overlook the fact that Judge Payne is an eminent Democrat, and he held a Cabinet position under President Wilson. There has never been a better Secretary of the Interior than he was. Is Mrs. August Belmont playing politics to relieve the President? Is John D. Ryan playing politics to relieve the President? They voted for the resolution of the central committee of the Red Cross declaring the Red Cross can not accept the appropriation proposed by the Senate.

SUFFICIENCY OF RED CROSS RELIEF IN ARKANSAS

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER] has sharply attacked the work of the Red Cross in Arkansas, criticizing the issuance of rations as insufficient. Please read the hearings, page 126, and the letter from Charles A. Walls, of Lonoke, Ark., said to be a nephew of Senator ROBINSON, and chairman of the Red Cross chapter there. Mr. Walls says:

I know that the average beneficiary now being served by the Red Cross here is receiving equally as much for a living as he receives in normal times, and it is unfair for anyone to try to create the impression that such is not the case.

He inclosed a statement from two reputable citizens of Arkansas. I think I have the right to presume that all the gentlemen who sign these statements are Democrats. Time does not permit me to read the statement in full, but these are extracts:

I personally know—

Says Mr. R. G. Kirk—

that the average beneficiary who is receiving help through the local chapter of the Red Cross at the present time is receiving as much food, clothing, and feed as he would have received under normal conditions.

W. W. McCrary says:

The ordinary requisition which I have filled calls for flour, meal, rice, beans, sugar, baking powder, canned salmon, canned tomatoes, and canned milk, etc., and ranges from \$4.20 to a larger amount, according to the number in a family, and is intended to feed a family for a period of two weeks. This ration, together with meat, turnips, turnip greens, potatoes, and the like, which are available to most of the families in this community, gives the average beneficiary a living as that which he normally has

during the two winter months of January and February, and, in my opinion, is ample to prevent suffering from want of food.

The acting chairman of the Osceola chapter, also in Arkansas, said this:

Personally let me say that this chapter is feeding the applicants for assistance with good, wholesome food in quantities more than said applicants would purchase at stores if they were paying with their own money for food they usually consume per week, and the quality is better from a balanced-ration standpoint than the average family would select for themselves; in other words, they have no just criticism from the standpoint of quantity or quality as you will see when you look over the list, a copy of which I will inclose with this letter.

I have quoted only briefly. At the end of my speech I will append these letters which give such an eloquent and satisfactory picture of the great relief work now carried on in Arkansas.

WHO FIXES THE STANDARD OF RELIEF?

Who is it that defines this standard of relief which was attacked just now by the gentleman from Arkansas? Who determines that standard of relief? Does Judge John Barton Payne determine it? Does the President of the United States determine it? No. The neighbors of the men, women, and children who receive the relief have determined what relief is necessary. [Applause.]

WHAT IS THE RED CROSS?

I want to ask you, do you know what the Red Cross organization does and how it works? It is a national organization with 2,500 chapters. Nearly every county in the United States has its chapter. When there is need for relief in any one of those counties that county goes as far as it can in taking care of itself. When it has reached the limit and there still remains a need then they come to the national organization, and what they ask for they get. [Applause.] No county in the United States and no city in the United States, in this combined emergency of unemployment and drought relief, has asked the National Red Cross for one penny they did not get. They started last August, and on the 27th of January they were feeding 659,000 people and they expect to feed more than that.

Read this summary which Judge Payne gives of the handling of this drought emergency:

DROUGHT RELIEF FURNISHED

In August last the President convened a meeting of the governors of most of the drought-affected States to develop plans to meet the many problems arising from the drought. A Federal drought committee was appointed to coordinate the efforts of Federal, State, and local governments, and other agencies in the field. State and county drought committees were authorized, all to do what they could to improve conditions in the affected territory through the development of new opportunities for employment, the creation of additional credit facilities, the reduction of freight rates, and finally through the administration of relief. The American Red Cross was present and accepted responsibility for the relief of the persons and families needing to be fed.

In September and October the Red Cross provided seed for pasturage and garden to needy families. This was done in 238 counties in the 6 States of Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas, and thousands of families thereby secured feed for their livestock and vegetables for home use which they otherwise would not have had. Seed for pasturage was given to 58,352 families and garden seed to 27,494 families.

We also carried on a general relief program in the drought territory, including provision of necessary food, clothing, and other relief, to families requiring assistance. To November 15 the need for Red Cross relief was confined to a relatively small number of families because many farmers had food or other resources, and cotton picking and other employment afforded a source of income in many instances. With the coming of winter the resources of many families were exhausted, various fields of industry having become inactive. It therefore became increasingly necessary for the Red Cross to extend relief. This was done to thousands of families with no resources, credit, or means of earning a livelihood. By December 31, 1930, food, clothing, and other relief, in addition to the seed above mentioned, had been given by the Red Cross to about 225,000 individuals in 338 counties; and by January 27, assistance had been given to approximately 659,000 individuals in 653 counties. This relief program included 19 States—Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Red Cross relief is based upon need, not loss. Many families affected by the drought do not require Red Cross assistance, because they have resources, credit, or income that enables them to recover without such help. In any community there may be hundreds of families not requiring Red Cross assistance and, at the same time, many of their neighbors who must depend on the relief organization for food, clothing, and other necessities. Because of these varying needs the Red Cross is administering relief to the drought sufferers on a case-by-case consideration of the situation of each family.

RED CROSS SAYS IT CAN DO THE JOB

What do they say about the situation? Judge Payne said to our committee, without any reservation, that if the Government of the United States will just keep out of the way they will take care of this emergency. [Applause.] He went further than that. He said the Red Cross had pledged itself to finish this job and it has funds enough, with the assistance of the funds mentioned, to do it. If it costs three times as much as has been estimated—he will take the highest estimate made—he pledges the country, if we will get out of the way, that they will take care of the emergency.

There is an emergency in the drought sections. They are organized to take care of it, and they are doing it, with the approval of the constituencies you Democrats represent, and most of that emergency has been in your territory.

CITIES ARE NOT ASKING FEDERAL MONEY

But there is another emergency in the cities, largely of unemployment. No city in the United States has asked the Red Cross for any aid. Judge Payne did not say that if they did ask it would be denied. He did say that until they did ask they would not go in. He said they did not want to embarrass the local organizations which are doing a splendid work. In the city of New York there are 50 organizations this day administering relief. Through bread lines and otherwise they are distributing food.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed eight minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will take three minutes more. There are 50 organizations giving some form of relief. Religious, racial, and other lines of demarcation separate them, but each is serving its own field. Every one of those 50 would be in danger of losing its own contributions once the Government of the United States went in there with its fund. Certainly until some city does ask us to come in there is no occasion for us to endanger the existence of the Red Cross by going in.

NO TIME NOW TO CHANGE HORSES

The Taylor amendment and the Byrns amendment recognize that the time has gone by when this House can seriously consider giving an appropriation to the Red Cross, which the responsible authorities of the Red Cross have said they can not accept. The gentlemen offering those amendments recognize it is too late to think of giving the Red Cross an appropriation which the heads of the Red Cross say would ruin the future usefulness of that organization.

But they say: Let the President distribute this through some other organization. What is the effect of the adoption of anyone of those amendments? It is this: You imperil the future of the Red Cross in continuing its drive, because you say you are going to set up some other organization. It will take some time to set up another organization.

In other words, they propose that we shall swap horses in the middle of the stream when there is a great emergency existing. Of course, there will be a great deal of waste of money in setting up a new organization. On the other hand, let me say to you in closing, you have a definite pledge from the Red Cross that if the Government will keep out of the way they will take care of the situation in their usual highly efficient and patriotic manner. And what can you do? The bigger the vote of confidence in the Red Cross to-day—because that is what it means—the more impetus you will give to the drive that is under way all over the United States. [Applause.]

I append the letters referred to and some very pertinent extracts from our committee hearings.

SENATE AMENDMENT 144

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be

immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

(Page 93)

The American Red Cross is a nation-wide organization, with general headquarters in Washington, branch offices in St. Louis and San Francisco—each having a specified number of States under its jurisdiction—with some 3,500 chapters, having 12,500 branches, covering the entire country. The chapters and their branches are composed of the leading citizens of each community. The normal work of the chapters includes home service for ex-service and service men and their families; public-health nursing; classes in first aid, life saving, home hygiene and care of the sick, and nutrition; Junior Red Cross activities in the schools, and various phases of volunteer service. The chapter is the unit for our roll call, for fund raising in disasters, and in the active work of the organization.

In times of disaster hundreds and sometimes thousands of volunteers enlist in the service, and the local chapter becomes a rallying point around which the resources of other organizations and individuals are assembled to meet the needs of the sufferers. In all counties seriously affected by the drought the local relief work has been organized under the direction of the chapter executive committee or a special relief committee, composed of leading citizens representing all sections of the affected territory. The men and women serving on these committees are volunteers, familiar with local conditions and with the needs of their neighbors, as well as with local standards of living. After interviewing applicants they determine the amount needed and give the applicant a written order on a country store for such food. A specified sum of money is stated in the order, and they select the food they need. The applicant is free to select staple articles of food that will serve him best. When the relief supplies have been delivered the merchant sends the bill to the chapter for payment. Funds are accounted for through the regular Red Cross accounting system.

I presume the committee knows that all receipts and expenditures of the Red Cross, from every source, must be audited by the War Department and certified to the Congress by the Secretary of War; so that you get our report each year, certified by the Secretary of War.

The national organization has about 150 well trained and experienced disaster workers constantly occupied in visiting the chapters and aiding them in the organization and administration of relief. This staff is constantly in touch with local conditions in seriously affected localities and has an intimate knowledge of the problems as they change from day to day. Complaints made to me and others at headquarters are at once referred to one of these workers.

LETTER FROM LONOKE (ARK.) CHAPTER

(Page 126)

Judge PAYNE. I have a letter here from Charles A. Walls, who is chairman of the chapter at Lonoke, Ark. He is a nephew of Senator ROBINSON. This letter contains two or three affidavits, and if I may I would like to file the letter and the affidavits and make them a part of the record.

(The letter and affidavits referred to are as follows:)

LONOKE, ARK., January 22, 1931.

Mr. WILLIAM M. BAXTER, Jr.,

The American Red Cross, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BAXTER: In accordance with your conversation over the telephone, I have obtained statements from W. W. McCrary, E. G. Kirk, and J. N. Eagle, the three largest planters and merchants in this community. Messrs. McCrary and Eagle furnish more people than all the rest of the merchants in this part of the county, and are more familiar with the supplies and advances that are ordinarily received by labor, than any other two men. Mr. Kirk works a great deal of labor and is familiar with supplies that labor ordinarily receives.

I sincerely trust that these statements will answer the purposes for which you desired them.

From personal information and observation I know that the average beneficiary now being served by the Red Cross here is receiving equally as much for a living as he receives in normal times, and it is unfair for anyone to try to create the impression that such is not the case.

If I can be of any further service to you, do not hesitate to let me hear from you.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. A. WALLS,
Chairman North Lonoke County (Ark.) Chapter,
The American Red Cross.

(Inclosures: 3.)

STATEMENT OF W. W. M'CRARY, OF LONOKE, ARK.

W. W. McCrary, on oath, states:

I am 54 years of age, a resident of Lonoke County, Ark., and have been engaged in the general mercantile business in the town

of Lonoke for the past 30 years. I am also interested in operating a number of farms in the Lonoke territory and am thoroughly familiar with the conditions which prevail among the laboring class, which is ordinarily termed "share croppers and tenants."

I have handled quite a large number of the requisitions for food and clothing which have been issued by the North Lonoke County (Ark.) Chapter of the American Red Cross and from the information which I have and the observation I have made of the beneficiaries I am of the opinion that the average beneficiary is receiving the normal amount of rations that he would have ordinarily received during the months of January and February in an average year.

The ordinary requisition which I have filled calls for flour, meal, rice, beans, sugar, baking powder, canned salmon, canned tomatoes, and canned milk, etc., and ranges from \$4.20 to a larger amount according to the number in a family, and is intended to feed a family for a period of two weeks. This ration, together with meat, turnips, turnip greens, potatoes, and the like, which are available to most of the families in this community, gives the average beneficiary a living as that which he normally has during the two winter months of January and February, and in my opinion is ample to prevent suffering from want of food.

The credit season in this territory does not open until about March 1 each year, and at that time merchants and landlords commence furnishing their labor, and the food supply, of course, is increased somewhat when farm operations start. By May 1 the average family residing upon a farm should begin receiving returns from an early garden and by June 1 should have a large amount of food in the garden.

This year it is the intention of the local merchants and landlords to reduce the usual allowances per month about 20 per cent as compared to the allowances heretofore made, on account of reduction in prices and the low prevailing price of cotton and farm products.

W. W. McCrary.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 21st day of January, 1931.

[SEAL.]

BEULA WILLIAMS, Notary Public.

My commission expires February 13, 1933.

STATEMENT OF J. N. EAGLE, OF LONOKE, ARK.

I, J. N. Eagle, of Lonoke, Ark., on oath states:

I am 42 years of age, a resident of Lonoke, Ark., and have been engaged in the general merchandise business in Lonoke, Ark., for the past 14 years, and prior to that time was familiar with farming conditions in Lonoke County.

I am now engaged in the mercantile business, also in operating a number of farms, and am thoroughly familiar with the conditions that prevail among the laboring class which is ordinarily designated as share croppers and tenants.

I have been handling quite a number of requisitions which have been issued by the local chapter of the American Red Cross and come in daily contact with the beneficiaries. From the information which I have and the observation I have made of the beneficiaries, I am of the opinion that the rationing of the average beneficiary is equal to the normal amount that the beneficiary receives in an average year during the months of January and February.

The grant that is made by the local chapter, consisting of flour, meal, rice, beans, sugar, baking powder, salmon, tomatoes, and the like, together with such meat, turnips, turnip greens, potatoes, etc., as is raised by some of the beneficiaries, is ample to sustain life and gives the beneficiary such a living as he has ordinarily received during the winter months.

It is our custom in this territory not to open up credit until about March 1 each year, and at that time merchants and landlords commence furnishing their labor, consisting of share croppers and tenants, and, of course, the food supply is increased when farm operations start. Usually we require them to plant a garden and the first month's rations amount to more than the following months' on account of seed furnished.

Grants ranging from \$4.20 for a small family to a greater amount for the larger families, according to number, for every two weeks, when taken in connection with the meat, turnips, and potatoes, which are available to most of the families in this community in my opinion, give them such a living as they normally have during the two winter months of January and February.

J. N. EAGLE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 21st day of January, 1931.

[SEAL.]

BEULA WILLIAMS, Notary Public.

STATEMENT OF R. G. KIRK

I, R. G. Kirk, of Lonoke, Ark., on oath state: I am a planter residing in Richwoods Township, 7 miles southwest of Lonoke, Lonoke County, Ark. My brother, T. F. Kirk, and I own a farm consisting of approximately 2,000 acres, of which about 1,000 acres are in actual cultivation. The rest of our farm is in pasture and timber.

I am serving as township committeeman in the Red Cross operations being carried on in Lonoke County at the present time and am familiar with the rationing that is being made to those who are beneficiaries. I have had considerable experience in working labor upon the farm and have personal knowledge of the

requirements of the ordinary family operating as share croppers or tenants in the winter months.

At the present time, by way of illustration, I have one family consisting of father, mother, and six children, all grown, living upon my farm, and I am allowing them on the basis of about \$16 per month in rations. The orders which are given by the North Lonoke County Chapter of the American Red Cross are meeting the requirements, and no one is starving or suffering that has come to my knowledge in my township.

The scale of allowances is graduated according to the number in the family and also according to the amount of food that a family has on hand at the time the application is made, and where a family has meat, meal, or lard on hand, it does not require as much for groceries as it otherwise would.

For the past 30 days I have been working almost daily in this work and have come in close contact with several hundred beneficiaries, and from observation and my personal knowledge of the matter, the situation is being satisfactorily and promptly met by the North Lonoke County Chapter.

I personally know that the average beneficiary who is receiving help through the local chapter of the Red Cross at the present time is receiving as much food, clothing, and feed as he would have received under normal conditions.

R. G. KIRK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of January, 1931.

[SEAL.]

BEULA WILLIAMS, Notary Public.

LETTER FROM OSCEOLA (ARK.) CHAPTER—RATIONS FURNISHED (Page 114)

Replying to your telegram of to-day, relative to criticism in newspapers and directed at the measure of relief being given by chapters in Arkansas, let me say that such criticism is unjust and uncalled for, if the people will give the American Red Cross officials a reasonable chance to meet their requirements. You know and I know that it takes a few days to get an organized force of relief workers functioning, but as a rule with the cooperation of the field man representing the national organization and the chapter chairmen with their other officers, we generally do things as well or probably much better than the critics would were they in charge of the work.

Personally let me say that this chapter is feeding the applicants for assistance with good wholesome food in quantities more than said applicants would purchase at stores if they were paying with their own money for food they usually consume per week, and the quality is better from a balanced-ration standpoint than the average family would select for themselves; in other words, they have no just criticism from the standpoint of quantity or quality as you will see when you look over the list, a copy of which I will inclose with this letter.

We have our chapter territory divided into nine districts (as we cover a territory 35 miles long by 25 miles wide), and we require a kitchen or flour-barrel inspection before rendering aid to any family. We are requiring as many as can do so to work in some capacity that will be of community benefit which we think will reduce number of applicants, and we think we are in touch with every part of the territory.

In closing may I ask that you have a duplicate deposit ticket showing amount deposited to credit of this chapter mailed promptly, as I have not received duplicate for last deposit through telegram of 15th advised \$7,000 had been allowed that day. Also please let me say that this chapter, its officers, and committee members appreciate more than I can find words to express, our heartfelt gratitude for the confidence you have shown by your responses to our calls for aid and assure you that we are trying to our utmost to merit that confidence and the aid you and your organization have given us in this trying time.

Cordially yours,

C. L. MOORE, Jr.,

Acting Chairman, Osceola Chapter.

Following that, he gives the supplies in the form of a ration list. Here is the ration for one in the family.

Mr. HASTINGS. Judge, what is the date of that other letter that you just read? I do not think you gave it.

Mr. PAYNE. That is dated on January 20, 1931, just a week ago.

For 1 in family, 12 pounds of flour; 5 pounds of meal; meat; 2 pounds of compound; split or pinto beans; 1 quart molasses; rice, whole grain; salt; laundry soap; and cabbage.

Ration list—Osceola Chapter, American Red Cross NO. 1

One in family:

2 weeks' supply—

| | |
|--|--------|
| 12 pounds flour | \$0.35 |
| Meal, 3 cents pound | .15 |
| Meat, 15 cents pound (D. S. clear bellies) | .50 |
| 2 pounds compound | .25 |
| Split or pinto beans | .25 |
| 1 quart molasses | .20 |
| Rice (whole grain) | .15 |
| Salt | .05 |
| Laundry soap | .05 |
| Cabbage, 3 cents pound | .10 |

2.05

NO. 2

Two in family:

2 weeks' supply—

| | |
|--|--------|
| 24-pound sack flour | \$0.60 |
| Meal, 3 cents pound | .20 |
| 6 pounds meat, 15 cents pound (D.S. clear bellies) | .90 |
| 4 pounds compound | .50 |
| ½ gallon molasses | .35 |
| Split or pinto beans | .35 |
| 4 pounds rice, 5 cents pound (whole grain) | .20 |
| Sugar, 6 cents pound | .25 |
| Cabbage (old), 3 cents pound | .25 |
| Salt | .05 |
| Dried peaches, 10 cents pound | .25 |
| Laundry soap | .10 |

4.00

ATTITUDE OF RED CROSS TOWARD PROPOSED GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION

(Page 100)

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose Congress should pass this bill authorizing the payment of \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross for the purposes specified in the bill, and it was accepted by the Red Cross, what effect, in your opinion, would it have, not only upon the Red Cross, but upon all those other philanthropic and charitable institutions throughout the country?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, in every campaign we have had we have found some people who say that the Red Cross is a semi-governmental agency. I do not mean that those people used just that technical word, but they mean the same thing. They say that Congress should appropriate money to be expended by the Red Cross for relief. In this campaign, we have been met everywhere with the statement that the Red Cross should expend the money for Congress, but that Congress should give the money for that purpose. Now, answering your question specifically, the public will not go into partnership with Congress in the matter of giving relief. If the Red Cross were forced to go to Congress to get its funds, it could not successfully collect funds by voluntary subscription, and it would speedily cease to be an effective organization.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to ask what effect such a policy of government contribution in lieu of popular subscription would have upon your organization from the standpoint of the voluntary work you receive everywhere to-day, from volunteer groups in the localities in which the work of distribution and the work of collecting funds are carried on.

Mr. PAYNE. It is very hard to answer that because people see things so differently, but my own conviction is that they would not work, and that, barring always a certain percentage, the Red Cross would find itself just as the Government finds itself—that is, it would have to hire people to do things.

(Page 101)

Mr. PAYNE. I have stated that the relief problem in the United States divides itself into two parts—first, unemployment, and, second, the drought. I stated that the unemployment question was being dealt with by the agencies in the cities through community chests and other organizations, and that the Red Cross, which never duplicates the work of any other effective organization, under the bill which I will read presently, would be forced into the cities in competition with all of those agencies. The other problem is the drought situation, which the Red Cross has undertaken to handle, and, so far as I know, it is doing that alone. It is not asking any assistance, and I believe that I am not immodest when I say that it is doing it well.

(Page 102)

That means, as I said a while ago, that we would have to make an organization in perhaps—oh, three or four or five hundred cities; I do not know how many. That of itself would cost an enormous amount of money and would be utterly impracticable, because it duplicates the efforts of other successful agencies, many of them having stood for years; some general, some Jewish, some Catholic, and so forth; and the Red Cross would be put in the position of competing with these organizations.

Then, just look at the situation we would be in. Mr. Green says there are 5,700,000 unemployed. Please do not assume I am saying that is correct. I do not pretend to know. But there are many. Suppose there are that many. That would be just a little over \$4 apiece. What would the Red Cross, after setting up these competing agencies throughout the United States, in the cities do with \$4 per head for relief?

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE

(Page 103)

Mr. PAYNE. We had a meeting of the central committee yesterday, knowing that I was to be called before this committee. The central committee felt it to be its duty to discuss this bill and to instruct me as to the position which I should take with respect

to it, and I take the liberty of reading the resolutions passed by the central committee yesterday:

"The central committee heard the statement of the chairman; his analysis of the provisions of the Senate bill appropriating \$25,000,000 to the American Red Cross for general relief, which is now pending in the House, and further heard his statement of the needs in the drought-stricken area, the amount of money remaining on hand from the \$5,000,000 disaster reserve fund heretofore appropriated, the amount reported from the present campaign, and the further sums which may reasonably be anticipated in view of the response to date and our present information as to the action of the various chapters.

"Whereupon it was on motion unanimously voted: That it is the sense of the central committee that the Red Cross is in a position adequately to complete the task it has undertaken in the drought-stricken areas, and it hereby assumes the responsibility of completing said task without public appropriations.

"And it was further on motion unanimously voted: That it is the sense of the central committee that the Red Cross can not accept the administration of the funds for general relief purposes as provided for under the terms of the bill which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you this question, Judge: Suppose the public were notified to-day that there would be no appropriation of \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross; how long do you suppose it would be before you would have your \$10,000,000?

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, when you are cooking and it gets a little cold it takes a little longer to revive it. But it would not take long.

Mr. CRAMTON. If this appropriation as now proposed and pending before this committee should be made, I would like to ask this twofold question: What, in your judgment, would be the effect of such appropriation and the acceptance of this much enlarged task by the Red Cross, first, upon private agencies now doing a wonderfully successful work, such as the Salvation Army, for instance, on the one hand; and what would be the effect upon the future career of the Red Cross and its future field of usefulness apart from Federal appropriations?

Mr. PAYNE. My conviction, Mr. Chairman, is that it would to a large extent destroy voluntary giving.

Mr. CRAMTON. By voluntary giving you mean to any such agency?

Mr. PAYNE. To any agency, not merely the Red Cross, but to any agency. I do not mean that is literally true, because when the Salvation Army comes around with its little collecting box, I think anybody will throw in a little money. But I mean, anything that looks to the doing of a real job. Because, as I said a while ago, you can not have the Government and private people competing in the same field of giving. You know, there has grown up in the country a notion that there is a great deal of money in the Government and, therefore, "Let George do it."

EFFECT OF PROPOSED GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION ON THE RED CROSS CAMPAIGN FOR FUNDS

(Page 98)

The CHAIRMAN. You stated a while ago, Judge, that what you have on hand for this relief, together with the \$10,000,000 that you have appealed for, in your opinion, will be an ample fund to take care of the present emergency. Now, I would like for you to state what effect, if any, the publicity that is being given to this estimate or application for \$25,000,000 to be paid by the United States Treasury to the Red Cross is having upon your subscriptions?

Mr. PAYNE. Paralyzing, Mr. Chairman. The Red Cross has only had about four or five drives, as we call them, since the war. We have gotten along with our own funds. We had some funds left over from the war. However, when a great disaster strikes the country, we have considered it necessary to appeal to the country for funds, because, as every business man knows, an organization like the Red Cross would be utterly unable to meet a great disaster if it had to wait to get the money before it could start to work. For instance, in the Mississippi flood we fed over 600,000 people. We had 130 or 140 concentration camps and we operated 1,000 boats.

Besides dealing with over 600,000 people we saved the lives of over 200,000 livestock from the flood. Now, suppose we had not had any money. Every one of you would have blushed for shame. I am only saying that for this reason: It is necessary for us to keep a fairly good surplus for emergencies. Now, when the President called this meeting in August, the governors were invited to be present. After the governors had stated their needs—and they were very real—the President said to me, "What has the Red Cross to meet this emergency?" I said, "We have a disaster reserve fund of \$5,000,000 for such a disaster as this." He said, "Is it immediately available?" The President's proclamation was issued on January 13, and that was the official beginning of our campaign. Ordinarily we would have received as much as \$1,000,000 per day, and the campaign would have been finished in 10 days or 2 weeks. Now, the next day Senator ROBINSON introduced his bill appropriating \$25,000,000 to be expended by the Red Cross, and on that day we got \$5,900.

Progress of the fund campaign—Cumulative

| Date | Daily contributions | Total of fund | Remarks |
|---------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| Jan. 11 | | | Sunday, President's letter published. |
| Jan. 12 | | | Monday, quotas sent out. |
| Jan. 13 | | | Tuesday, President's proclamation. |
| Jan. 14 | \$5,900.00 | \$5,900.00 | Senator Robinson introduced amendment to agriculture appropriation bill. |
| Jan. 15 | 207,209.00 | 213,109.00 | Senator Robinson introduced amendment to interior appropriation bill. |
| Jan. 16 | 180,985.00 | 394,094.00 | |
| Jan. 17 | 124,420.00 | 518,514.00 | |
| Jan. 18 | 79,444.00 | 597,958.00 | |
| Jan. 19 | 43,589.00 | 641,547.00 | Monday, central committee meeting. |
| Jan. 20 | 170,759.00 | 812,306.00 | |
| Jan. 21 | 149,353.00 | 961,659.00 | |
| Jan. 22 | 165,185.00 | 1,126,844.00 | Thursday, radio broadcast. |
| Jan. 23 | 136,959.00 | 1,263,803.00 | |
| Jan. 24 | 407,149.00 | 1,670,952.00 | |
| Jan. 25 | 454,448.00 | 2,125,400.00 | |
| Jan. 26 | 79,587.00 | 2,204,987.00 | |
| Jan. 27 | 1,460,013.00 | 3,665,000.00 | Tuesday, central committee meeting. |
| Jan. 28 | | 3,880,506.00 | Wednesday, House committee hearing. |

9 a. m.

(Page 106)

Mr. PAYNE. I think the American people are the most generous people in the world. But they must be given a clear field. I know that in this present campaign of ours, splendid men, liberal givers, have insisted that if we accept an appropriation from the Government we must return their contribution. That is true to such an extent that in St. Louis and Kansas City the chairmen of the Red Cross chapters have announced publicly, because they could not otherwise get subscriptions, that if the Red Cross accepted this appropriation from the Government, all contributions will be returned.

(Page 111)

Mr. PAYNE. I have been thrown against this proposition for a long time. I am now serving in my tenth year as chairman of the Red Cross, and I know from my contacts with the people that the moment it is proposed to get money from Congress the voluntary contributions will go.

RED CROSS WILL DO THE JOB

(Page 130)

Mr. PAYNE. Yes. This is the point. Congress is trying to give us, from your point of view, \$25,000,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Trying to make it available in the event it is necessary.

Mr. PAYNE. That is a better way to say it, and I accept that. I say we do not have to have it because with the money we have on hand from our reserve which I have mentioned and the fund that we expect confidently to get we have enough.

But suppose we do not. The Red Cross has pledged itself to finish this job, and it has funds enough, with the assistance of the funds I have mentioned, to do it, if it costs three times as much as you think it will cost.

RELIEF ACTION BY STATE LEGISLATURES

(Page 108)

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Payne, in your testimony this morning you mentioned the fact that in the State of Oklahoma a bill had been introduced in the legislature for an appropriation of \$400,000 for the relief of distress in that State. Do you know of any other States that up to this time have either contributed any money or taken any steps toward making a contribution from the State treasuries?

Mr. PAYNE. It is my information that no other State has done anything; but the Governor of Texas, I am informed by my assistant, has announced that if the situation should become acute, Texas would make some appropriation. I do not believe, however, that they have introduced any legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. None of the other States, so far as you know, have made public contributions from their treasuries up to the present time?

Mr. PAYNE. No.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF IN CITIES

(Page 110)

Mr. BYRNS. So it is not the purpose to use any of this \$10,000,000 for the relief of the unemployed or the needy in the cities?

Mr. PAYNE. No; for the reason that the Red Cross is not operating in extending relief for unemployment, and is not operating in extending relief in the cities.

Mr. BYRNS. You are, of course, familiar with the question which was raised on the floor and discussed with a great deal of earnestness by representatives from the cities to the effect that if relief was going to be given by Congress in the way of food for use in the rural sections, the same relief should be given to those who are equally in need, and in some instances more so, in the cities and towns.

Mr. PAYNE. I would have some difficulty in answering that argument.

Mr. BYRNS. I would, too; because I think it is justified. The point I was trying to bring out was this, that with the funds which the Red Cross is now engaged in raising, it will not be

expected that any portion of them will be used in the cities, but wholly in the country, and unless Congress should make a contribution, or, rather, unless the Government through Congress should make a contribution, the cities need expect no relief through the Red Cross in this present emergency.

Mr. PAYNE. They have asked none. They understand the situation perfectly, and there is no sort of controversy between us and the organizations operating in the cities. As a matter of fact, as I stated this morning, 360 cities are organized with community chests.

ANSWER OF JUDGE PAYNE TO ATTACKS ON RED CROSS DECISION

No thoughtful member or friend of the Red Cross will be deceived by the charge made in the Senate that in refusing to administer a twenty-five million general relief fund, proposed to be voted by the Congress, the Red Cross is "playing politics"; on the contrary, the Red Cross has, after the most careful consideration, determined that the welfare of the Red Cross and those it is now helping and will help in the future requires that it will continue its historic voluntary rôle and refuse to be drawn into politics.

In August the Red Cross assumed responsibility for drought relief and has extended relief to the drought sufferers in the 21 States. The actual work has been done through the local Red Cross chapters and their branches; that is, the neighbors and friends of the sufferers in their home localities have extended the actual relief, have determined the amount and character of the ration to be given, the National Red Cross organization making cash grants to the chapters as needed. In addition to this in many localities a hot luncheon is served to the children in the schools. This work will be continued until it is completed.

The twenty-five million bill under discussion is a general relief bill, and not a drought relief bill. The bill provides as follows:

"There is hereby appropriated * * * \$25,000,000 to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure the same."

This contemplates—

a. That the \$25,000,000 shall be expended by the Red Cross.

b. That it be expended anywhere within the United States to persons otherwise unable to procure relief.

This would require the Red Cross to expend this money everywhere in the United States where needed—unemployment in the cities, in the drought area, and anything else.

Unemployment relief is being given by splendid relief agencies in the cities throughout the country, such as the Salvation Army, the great Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant charitable organizations, and those which, like the Red Cross, are entirely nonsectarian. Funds for relief are being raised by voluntary subscription and by 360 community chests. For the Red Cross to undertake the administration of this bill would seriously embarrass all these agencies and require the setting up of organizations by the Red Cross, duplicating the agencies now operating. This would be enormously expensive, harmful to other agencies, and useless. It could not turn over a dollar of the money to other agencies to be expended, because by terms of the bill the money must be expended by the Red Cross.

If it is conceivable that the Red Cross could go into the cities, create organizations, duplicate the work of other agencies, in order to comply with the will of Congress, the sum appropriated by this bill is hopelessly inadequate.

The president of the Federation of Labor states that there are 5,700,000 people unemployed. Assuming this is true and that each one represents a family of four, including himself, this would provide just a fraction over \$1 per person. The consequences would be that the Red Cross would have created organizations duplicating agencies in hundreds of cities, assumed an impossible task under the circumstances, with a fund so small, in view of the enormous problem confronting it, as to invite certain failure and probable disaster.

For these reasons the central committee, after mature consideration, felt constrained to refuse to assume the administration of the bill.

JUDGE PAYNE ISSUES STATEMENT ON RED CROSS FINANCES

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14.—In response to a request late Wednesday for a statement concerning Red Cross finances, Judge John Barton Payne, chairman of the central committee, said:

"There is no need for any misunderstanding or uncertainty as to the funds of the Red Cross. It publishes and distributes widely each year an annual report which contains in detail the financial statement audited by the War Department. The financial report of the year ended June 30, 1930, was transmitted to the Congress October 10, 1930, by the Secretary of War, with the certificate of the Secretary that it had been audited by the Chief of Finance of the Army and found correct. A copy of this report was sent to each Senator and Congressman last October, and some 8,000 copies in all were distributed.

"Unless the National Red Cross maintained substantial reserves it would be utterly unable to respond to emergencies when they arise. If it were necessary to go out and raise funds before any relief could be started, tremendous suffering would result. The American Red Cross in a large sense represents the Government and the people of the United States, and must be like our Army and Navy, ready at all times to respond. Hence it is imperative

that a very substantial reserve be maintained which must be replenished.

"The exact financial situation of the Red Cross (as of November 30, 1930) is this: It has an endowment fund and reserve permanently invested of \$11,253,000, the income of which is available for current use. It has a disaster fund of \$5,000,000, which has been appropriated for this present drought relief, of which \$1,000,000 has already (January 13) been expended. After providing the budget of \$2,226,000 for the work of this fiscal year the Red Cross holds \$1,734,000, devoted to our compelling obligation for continuing service to the disabled ex-service men and women of the World War. It has a fund of \$850,000 supplemented by an appropriation by the Congress for the replacement of the war-time frame office building, the use of which must be discontinued in accordance with the Government's building program. There are restricted funds of \$158,000. There remains \$4,658,000 to safeguard all the other obligations to which the organization is committed, including immediate response to any other domestic disasters which may occur and the continuance of our regular program of public-health nursing, first aid and life saving, nutrition, home hygiene and care of the sick, Junior Red Cross, and the work for the men now serving in the Regular Army and Navy, both in this country, in our insular possessions, and at foreign stations.

"Since July 1, 1919, the National Red Cross has expended \$37,000,000 over and above all of its receipts during that period. Then its funds available for expenditure were \$51,000,000. During that 11-year period the balance has been reduced to \$14,000,000 committed as indicated above. It can not go on forever depleting its reserves and still be prepared for service such as is required in this present and in like emergencies.

"The Red Cross will welcome the most searching investigation of its financial affairs at any time."

Estimated total Federal-aid and State highway program, 1931

| State | Total Federal-aid program | Construction program to be financed by State funds alone | Maintenance program | Estimated grand total program |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Alabama..... | \$14,123,936.60 | | \$1,200,000.00 | \$15,323,936.60 |
| Arizona..... | 5,288,110.00 | 108,000.00 | 1,100,000.00 | 6,506,110.00 |
| Arkansas..... | 9,385,608.10 | 3,000,000.00 | 2,600,000.00 | 14,985,608.10 |
| California..... | 12,323,832.90 | 13,000,000.00 | 6,500,000.00 | 31,823,832.90 |
| Colorado..... | 8,458,489.55 | 709,000.00 | 1,400,000.00 | 10,567,489.55 |
| Connecticut..... | 3,604,504.40 | 16,000,000.00 | 2,500,000.00 | 22,104,504.40 |
| Delaware..... | 1,578,138.99 | | 250,000.00 | 1,828,138.99 |
| Florida..... | 7,128,212.53 | 2,000,000.00 | 2,300,000.00 | 11,428,212.53 |
| Georgia..... | 13,514,144.72 | 2,300,000.00 | 1,200,000.00 | 17,014,144.72 |
| Idaho..... | 3,992,056.62 | 1,920,000.00 | 1,000,000.00 | 6,912,056.62 |
| Illinois..... | 19,390,647.86 | 6,000,000.00 | 2,600,000.00 | 27,990,647.86 |
| Indiana..... | 12,635,930.38 | 4,000,000.00 | 3,600,000.00 | 20,235,930.38 |
| Iowa..... | 6,878,592.75 | 14,000,000.00 | 4,600,000.00 | 25,478,592.75 |
| Kansas..... | 10,626,239.83 | 1,000,000.00 | 3,700,000.00 | 15,326,239.83 |
| Kentucky..... | 8,145,667.65 | 1,000,000.00 | 3,000,000.00 | 12,145,667.65 |
| Louisiana..... | 7,360,992.69 | 30,000,000.00 | 2,000,000.00 | 39,360,992.69 |
| Maine..... | 5,034,808.59 | 883,000.00 | 3,255,000.00 | 9,182,808.59 |
| Maryland..... | 2,465,188.07 | | 4,000,000.00 | 6,465,188.07 |
| Massachusetts..... | 9,011,927.12 | 1,500,000.00 | 1,000,000.00 | 11,511,927.12 |
| Michigan..... | 14,102,920.90 | 10,000,000.00 | 7,500,000.00 | 31,602,920.90 |
| Minnesota..... | 8,501,967.46 | 7,175,000.00 | 5,100,000.00 | 20,776,967.46 |
| Mississippi..... | 11,562,266.30 | | 2,500,000.00 | 14,062,266.30 |
| Missouri..... | 12,011,697.51 | 18,000,000.00 | 4,700,000.00 | 34,711,697.51 |
| Montana..... | 12,975,316.16 | | 1,200,000.00 | 14,175,316.16 |
| Nebraska..... | 10,560,124.97 | 2,000,000.00 | 3,200,000.00 | 15,760,124.97 |
| Nevada..... | 3,297,513.90 | 800,000.00 | 550,000.00 | 4,647,513.90 |
| New Hampshire..... | 1,351,560.18 | 2,000,000.00 | 1,800,000.00 | 5,151,560.18 |
| New Jersey..... | 5,548,733.76 | 28,011,000.00 | 2,500,000.00 | 36,059,733.76 |
| New Mexico..... | 5,369,804.87 | 500,000.00 | 1,400,000.00 | 7,269,804.87 |
| New York..... | 40,096,176.64 | 20,000,000.00 | 10,000,000.00 | 70,096,176.64 |
| North Carolina..... | 10,687,671.07 | 500,000.00 | 4,600,000.00 | 15,787,671.07 |
| North Dakota..... | 7,003,891.09 | | 900,000.00 | 7,903,891.09 |
| Ohio..... | 11,762,585.14 | 5,000,000.00 | 13,900,000.00 | 30,662,585.14 |
| Oklahoma..... | 5,926,827.33 | 1,000,000.00 | 2,500,000.00 | 9,426,827.33 |
| Oregon..... | 6,062,280.45 | 5,000,000.00 | 4,000,000.00 | 15,062,280.45 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 14,564,187.70 | | 20,000,000.00 | 34,564,187.70 |
| Rhode Island..... | 2,125,090.33 | 240,000.00 | 1,000,000.00 | 3,365,090.33 |
| South Carolina..... | 5,414,636.12 | 10,000,000.00 | 2,100,000.00 | 17,514,636.12 |
| South Dakota..... | 6,127,315.33 | | 1,900,000.00 | 8,027,315.33 |
| Tennessee..... | 8,444,580.06 | 10,000,000.00 | 3,500,000.00 | 21,944,580.06 |
| Texas..... | 27,506,837.27 | 12,000,000.00 | 12,000,000.00 | 51,506,837.27 |
| Utah..... | 3,424,231.19 | 500,000.00 | 1,000,000.00 | 4,924,231.19 |
| Vermont..... | 1,327,553.37 | 287,000.00 | 1,000,000.00 | 2,614,553.37 |
| Virginia..... | 6,954,975.23 | 2,000,000.00 | 4,000,000.00 | 12,954,975.23 |
| Washington..... | 6,539,645.53 | 6,000,000.00 | 3,100,000.00 | 15,639,645.53 |
| West Virginia..... | 4,441,115.37 | 9,500,000.00 | 3,000,000.00 | 16,941,115.37 |
| Wisconsin..... | 8,089,856.24 | 11,600,000.00 | 3,800,000.00 | 23,489,856.24 |
| Wyoming..... | 3,469,968.90 | 900,000.00 | 1,100,000.00 | 5,469,968.90 |
| Hawaii..... | 4,273,270.34 | | | 4,273,270.34 |
| Total..... | 430,830,630.06 | 260,433,000.00 | 171,665,000.00 | 862,928,630.06 |

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Red Cross has been dragged into this controversy. All of us have the highest respect for that organization, and if they refuse to accept the burden cast upon them by the Senate amendment, they are within their rights and they should not be forced to accept a responsibility which they decline.

The great issue here to-day is not, as the gentleman who has just spoken has stated, to defend the name of the Red Cross. No one has attacked the Red Cross, and it is unfair in debate to put the issue on this motion on the basis of support of the Red Cross or antagonism to the Red Cross. [Applause.] We are with the Red Cross. We feel they are within their rights in declining the responsibility, but there are other agencies and other ways of accomplishing the purpose. The Taylor amendment and the Byrns amendment both offer a solution, namely, to put the disposition of this fund in the hands of the President—and I may be pardoned, I trust, in also paying a compliment to the President. Nobody on this side has derided the President. We trust him, we know his record and his reputation, but even that is not the question. The question is this: It turns about the conditions that prevail in this country to-day. Five million seven hundred thousand people are out of work, and these men and their families are facing starvation. Think of it! In a land of plenty, overflowing with the products of the farm and factory, our warehouses bulging with commodities which the industry of our people has created, yet there is economic distress throughout the land. Savings banks hold more deposits to-day than they ever did before in our history. What is wrong with economic conditions in our land where such contrasts prevail? Come down from the seats of the mighty ye law givers. Hang your heads in shame. Put on sackcloth and ashes and repent for your neglect.

The measure before us is a precautionary one. Congress may be in session after March 4 or it may not. What harm is there in putting a fund of \$25,000,000, Mr. Speaker, in the hands of the President to use in his discretion. If it is not used it remains in the Treasury. You can not excuse yourselves for your failure by the declaration of the Red Cross to accept the trust. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment which I have sent to the desk may be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON: I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: Substitute for the language of the Senate amendment the following: "That the sum of \$50,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be available until July 1, 1931, to the President of the United States for disbursement by him at his discretion for the relief of persons residing in the United States who may be in need of the necessities of life. In disbursing the said sum the President shall have authority to use and employ such agencies as he may create for that purpose or as may already exist in communities, and may cooperate with States, counties, and municipalities upon such terms and conditions as he may deem best, and may disburse same either in the purchase of supplies or by payments in money to the beneficiaries."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order upon the amendment. I did not get all the amendment, but my immediate thought, I will say, is that the House having made no appropriation for this purpose, the Senate having proposed \$25,000,000, the only sums we could consider would be between nothing and \$25,000,000, but I reserve the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I interrupted the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] to say that the National Red Cross has not contributed one penny to the relief of the destitute in my home city of Birmingham. My statement was strictly accurate. Furthermore, Judge Payne did not say anything in the hearing to the contrary. He stated merely that there was a chapter of the Red Cross at Birmingham which had charge of relief work there.

Every cent of the funds of the Birmingham chapter is received from our community chest. In coordinating the work of the various local relief organizations, the share set apart for destitution work is turned over to the local chapter of the Red Cross, which administers those funds. Other shares from the community chest are administered by the

Salvation Army, Mercy Home, and so on with other organizations, each being intrusted with a certain work, other than destitution relief, which is the exclusive field of the local Red Cross chapter.

There is much force in Judge Payne's position that the National Red Cross is not equipped to handle nation-wide destitution relief. Fundamentally, it is designed for disaster work. The local chapters are not staffed for relief work, and have had no experience in its administration. The situation at Birmingham is probably unique. I know of no other city in which the local Red Cross chapter has charge of similar work.

Mr. Speaker, in the President's address read in this Chamber on the 4th day of December, he said:

We have as a nation a definite duty to see that no deserving person in our country suffers from hunger or cold.

Immediately upon the reading of this address, and moved by this noble, humanitarian sentiment, I introduced a bill which is the substance of my amendment which has just been read.

As I heard the words of the President I visualized the Hoover of old—Hoover, the great humanitarian leader in relief of suffering and hunger throughout the world. I have not completely lost sight of that visualization even to this time.

The President has done and said much since that day which has caused a different impression of him to be raised up in the country. Many are now tempted to look upon him as cold and indifferent to suffering. I have even heard it said that it is useless to place this money for relief in President Hoover's hands; that he will refuse to administer the relief; it will do no good. It is even charged that he will administer it unfairly and in a way unworthy of his reputation and of his humanitarian past. They say that he has become a mere politician who juggles with human misery for partisan purposes. But I have been unwilling to agree that this picture truly portrays the President, even at the present time.

I feel that the trouble is that the President has yielded to ill advice which has placed him before the country and the suffering millions of America as a man lacking in the instincts of humanity, who is willing to give the shadow but not the substance, and who, by stubborn and willful adherence to a particular plan of his own, is willing to deny all relief and let the suffering go on. I do not feel that this is the true Hoover—it certainly is not the best Hoover.

I do not believe this is a true picture of our President. He has done much, I admit, to give this impression, but I feel it has been done through listening to the advice of false friends, who loved him less than the political party which they would serve, and that it does not represent the true Hoover.

I am yet willing to trust him. I am willing to give him the money and the power to relieve the suffering and distress throughout this country. I believe that the better Hoover will respond to the responsibility. I am yet willing to trust to the old Hoover.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the old Hoover, to the better Hoover. Thousands of helpless men, women, and children are starving. I appeal from Hoover, the politician, to Hoover the humanitarian. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the eloquent eulogy of the President of the United States which has just been given, I withdraw the point of order. [Laughter.] I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, let us start with this proposition—that the American Red Cross is taking care of the drought-relief situation. This has been established beyond any shadow of doubt; and more than this, the Red Cross has guaranteed for the future that this institution will take care of any relief that may be necessary, even though it may require three times any amount that has thus far been estimated.

Now, having established these facts, it becomes necessary for the proponents of this \$25,000,000 appropriation in some way or other to brush aside the Red Cross. Unless they can get the Red Cross out of the way, there is no sound basis for the \$25,000,000 appropriation.

At the other end of the Capitol one method of disposing of the Red Cross is being followed, and that is by the use of all the abusive language that can be mustered in berating the Red Cross, the President, and John Barton Payne.

At this end of the Capitol a different method of attack is adopted, but for the same purpose. With one exception the Democratic speakers here to-day have tried to kill the Red Cross, Judge Payne, and, strange to relate, even the President, with kindness, with praise, and with eulogies. Just, as at the other end of the Capitol, they realize that the Red Cross must be eliminated or they have no case.

Now, what will be the effect? My friend from New York [Mr. REED] was criticized because he said that each man who voted for this proposition raised his hand as an assassin against the Red Cross. I do not need to use such strong language, but, whether it will result in slow death, like slow poison or by violence, it does not matter. It is the deathblow to the Red Cross as a voluntary charitable institution. It becomes in a measure a governmental bureau, with all that this implies.

Once we resort to public charity we must come back again and again and again to the same source of supply, for all other sources will soon dry up.

What is this \$25,000,000 as compared with all the funds for charities that are being contributed and utilized all over the country? One city in our country will use more than this amount in a very short time; and think of the thousands of charitable organizations all over the country, each doing its share. This appropriation, if it becomes a precedent, as it will if now adopted, will tend to close the doors that lead to the hearts of the people; and it will, in the end, deprive all of these charitable associations of what they have had before, support and cooperation, through the warm, throbbing hearts of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. First pending is the motion which I made to disagree to the Senate amendment; immediately following was the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede and concur with an amendment. There are other proposed amendments that have been offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]. May I ask what the procedure will be for the most orderly disposition of these amendments?

The SPEAKER. The previous question being ordered under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair will first submit the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to concur with an amendment. Following that, he will submit the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Next the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]; next the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN]; and following that the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]; and last the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado to concur in amendment 144 with an amendment.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 144 with the following amendment: Page 129, line 18, after the word "by," strike out "the American National Red Cross" and insert "and under the direction of the President of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 217, answered "present" 1, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—151

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Abernethy | Denison | Johnson, Okla. | Patman |
| Allgood | DeRouen | Johnson, Tex. | Patterson |
| Almon | Dominick | Jones, Tex. | Peavey |
| Arnold | Dorsey | Kemp | Pittenger |
| Aswell | Doughton | Kerr | Prall |
| Auf der Heide | Doxey | Kvale | Quin |
| Ayres | Drane | LaGuardia | Ragon |
| Bankhead | Drewry | Lambertson | Rainey, Henry T. |
| Bell | Driver | Lanham | Ramspeck |
| Black | Edwards | Lankford, Ga. | Rankin |
| Bland | Eslick | Larsen | Rayburn |
| Blanton | Evans, Mont. | Lindsay | Romjue |
| Bloom | Finley | Linthicum | Rutherford |
| Box | Fisher | Lozier | Sanders, Tex. |
| Brand, Ga. | Frear | Ludlow | Sandlin |
| Briggs | Fuller | McClintic, Okla. | Schneider |
| Browne | Gambrill | McCormack, Mass. | Sears |
| Browning | Garber, Okla. | McDuffie | Sinclair |
| Busby | Garner | McKeown | Smith, W. Va. |
| Byrns | Glover | McReynolds | Somers, N. Y. |
| Campbell, Iowa | Goldsborough | McSwain | Spearing |
| Canfield | Granfield | Mansfield | Steagall |
| Cannon | Green | Mead | Stone |
| Cartwright | Greenwood | Milligan | Summers, Tex. |
| Christgau | Gregory | Montague | Taylor, Colo. |
| Clark, N. C. | Griffin | Montet | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Collier | Hall, Miss. | Moore, Ky. | Underwood |
| Collins | Hancock, N. C. | Moore, Va. | Vinson, Ga. |
| Condon | Hare | Nelson, Mo. | Warren |
| Connelly | Hastings | Nelson, Wis. | Whitehead |
| Cooper, Tenn. | Hill, Ala. | Norton | Whittington |
| Cooper, Wis. | Hill, Wash. | O'Connor, La. | Wilson |
| Gox | Howard | O'Connor, N. Y. | Wingo |
| Craddock | Huddleston | Oldfield | Woodrum |
| Crisp | Hull, Tenn. | Oliver, Ala. | Wright |
| Cross | Hull, Wis. | Palmisano | Yon |
| Crosser | James, N. C. | Parks | Zihlman |
| Davis | Jeffers | Parsons | |

NAYS—217

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Ackerman | Elliott | Kinzer | Shott, W. Va. |
| Adkins | Ellis | Knutson | Shreve |
| Aldrich | Englebright | Kopp | Simmons |
| Allen | Erk | Korell | Simms |
| Andresen | Estep | Kurtz | Sloan |
| Andrew | Fish | Langley | Smith, Idaho |
| Arentz | Fort | Lankford, Va. | Snell |
| Bacharach | Foss | Leavitt | Snow |
| Bachmann | Free | Leech | Sparks |
| Bacon | Freeman | Lehlbach | Speaks |
| Beedy | French | Letts | Sproul, Ill. |
| Beers | Garber, Va. | Loofbourov | Sproul, Kans. |
| Blackburn | Gavagan | Luce | Stafford |
| Bohn | Gibson | McClintock, Ohio | Stalker |
| Bolton | Gifford | McCormick, Ill. | Stobbs |
| Bowman | Goodwin | McLaughlin | Strong, Kans. |
| Brand, Ohio | Goss | McLeod | Strong, Pa. |
| Brigham | Graham | Maas | Sullivan, Pa. |
| Britten | Guyer | Magrady | Summers, Wash. |
| Brumm | Hadley | Manlove | Swanson |
| Buchanan | Hale | Mapes | Swick |
| Burdick | Hall, Ill. | Martin | Swing |
| Burtness | Hall, Ind. | Menges | Taber |
| Butler | Hall, N. Dak. | Merritt | Temple |
| Campbell, Pa. | Halsey | Michener | Thatcher |
| Carter, Calif. | Hancock, N. Y. | Miller | Thurston |
| Carter, Wyo. | Hartley | Moore, Ohio | Tilson |
| Chalmers | Haugen | Morehead | Timberlake |
| Chase | Hawley | Morgan | Tinkham |
| Chindblom | Hess | Mouser | Treadway |
| Chipperfield | Hickey | Murphy | Tucker |
| Christopherson | Hoch | Nelson, Me. | Underhill |
| Clague | Hogg, Ind. | Newhall | Vestal |
| Clancy | Hogg, W. Va. | Nolan | Vincent, Mich. |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Holaday | O'Connor, Okla. | Wainwright |
| Cochran, Pa. | Hooper | Palmer | Walker |
| Cole | Hope | Parker | Wason |
| Colton | Hopkins | Perkins | Watres |
| Connolly | Houston, Del. | Pratt, Ruth | Watson |
| Cooper, Ohio | Hudson | Pritchard | Welch, Calif. |
| Coyle | Hull, Morton D. | Purnell | Welsh, Pa. |
| Crall | Hull, William E. | Ramey, Frank M. | White |
| Cramton | Irwin | Ramseyer | Whitley |
| Crowther | Johnson, Ind. | Ransley | Wigglesworth |
| Culkin | Johnson, Nebr. | Reece | Williamson |
| Dallinger | Johnston, Mo. | Reed, N. Y. | Wolfenden |
| Darrow | Jonas, N. C. | Rellly | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Davenport | Kading | Robinson | Wolverton, W. Va. |
| De Priest | Kahn | Rogers | Wood |
| Dickinson | Kelly | Schafer, Wis. | Woodruff |
| Dowell | Kendall, Ky. | Seger | Wurzbach |
| Dunbar | Kendall, Pa. | Selberling | Wyant |
| Dyer | Kennedy | Selvig | |
| Eaton, Colo. | Ketcham | Shaffer, Va. | |
| Eaton, N. J. | Kiefner | Short, Mo. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cochran, Mo.

NOT VOTING—62

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Baird | Douglass, Mass. | James, Mich. | Pratt, Harcourt J. |
| Barbour | Doutrich | Jenkins | Reid, Ill. |
| Beck | Doyle | Johnson, Ill. | Rich |
| Boylan | Esterly | Johnson, S. Dak. | Rowbottom |
| Brunner | Evans, Calif. | Johnson, Wash. | Sabath |
| Buckbee | Fenn | Kearns | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Cable | Fitzgerald | Kunz | Sirovich |
| Carley | Fitzpatrick | Lea | Stevenson |
| Celler | Fulmer | McFadden | Sullivan, N. Y. |
| Clark, Md. | Garrett | McMillan | Tarver |
| Cooke | Gasque | Michaelson | Thompson |
| Corning | Golder | Mooney | Turpin |
| Cullen | Hardy | Niedringhaus | Williams |
| Dempsey | Hoffman | Oliver, N. Y. | Yates |
| Dickstein | Hudspeth | Owen | |
| Douglas, Ariz. | Igoe | Pou | |

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cochran of Missouri (for) with Mr. Niedringhaus (against).
 Mr. James of Michigan (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
 Mr. Carley (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).
 Mr. Cullen (for) with Mr. Evans of California (against).
 Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Johnson of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Brunner (for) with Mr. Hoffman (against).
 Mr. Sullivan of New York (for) with Mr. Hardy (against).
 Mr. Oliver of New York (for) with Mr. Turpin (against).
 Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt (against).
 Mr. Pou (for) with Mr. Beck (against).
 Mr. Tarver (for) with Mr. Fenn (against).
 Mr. Igoe (for) with Mr. Golder (against).
 Mr. Stevenson (for) with Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (against).
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
 Mr. Sabath (for) with Mr. Sanders of New York (against).
 Mr. Fulmer (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Kearns (against).
 Mr. Williams (for) with Mr. Rich (against).
 Mr. Garrett (for) with Mr. Esterly (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Barbour with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Gasque.
 Mr. Cable with Mr. Lea.
 Mr. Baird with Mr. Mooney.
 Mr. Jenkins with Mrs. Owen.
 Mr. Buckbee with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Cooke with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Clark of Maryland with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Hudspeth.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, Mr. EVANS, is ill and unable to be here to-day. He desires me to state that if he were present he would vote "no."

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with my colleague, Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS, who is ill. Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] in a nature of a substitute amendment for the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Without objection, the Clerk will report the LaGuardia motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 129, line 18, after the word "be," strike out the balance of the line and the words "the American Red Cross" in line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Distributed by the President of the United States in his discretion to national charitable welfare, fraternal, or religious organizations in amounts equal to the amount raised and expended by such organizations."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 65, noes 255.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], which the Clerk, without objection, will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS moves to concur in the Senate amendment 144 with the following amendment: After the words "Red Cross" in line 19, page 129, insert the following: "Or other such agency as it may select," and strike out the period at the end of line 22 on page 129 and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided,

That if the American National Red Cross shall decline to distribute the money herein appropriated through its regularly organized agencies in the manner herein provided, then in such event the President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to immediately designate some governmental agency or other agency selected by him to make distribution of all or any portion of said sum in cash, or in the purchase of said-named supplies as may be necessary to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure same."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—149

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Abernethy | DeRouen | Jones, Tex. | Patterson |
| Allgood | Domnick | Kemp | Peavey |
| Almon | Dorsey | Kennedy | Pittenger |
| Arnold | Doughton | Kerr | Prall |
| Aswell | Doxey | Kvale | Quin |
| Auf der Heide | Drane | LaGuardia | Ragon |
| Ayres | Drewry | Lambertson | Rainey, Henry T. |
| Bankhead | Driver | Langley | Ramspeck |
| Bell | Edwards | Lanham | Rankin |
| Black | Eslick | Lankford, Ga. | Romjue |
| Bland | Evans, Mont. | Larsen | Rutherford |
| Blanton | Finley | Lindsay | Sanders, Tex. |
| Bloom | Fisher | Linthicum | Sandlin |
| Box | Fuller | Lozier | Schneider |
| Brand, Ga. | Gambrell | Ludlow | Sears |
| Briggs | Garber, Okla. | McClintic, Okla. | Sinclair |
| Browne | Garner | McCormack, Mass. | Smith, W. Va. |
| Browning | Glover | McDuffie | Somers, N. Y. |
| Busby | Goldsborough | McKeown | Spearing |
| Byrns | Granfield | McReynolds | Steagall |
| Campbell, Iowa | Green | McSwain | Stone |
| Canfield | Greenwood | Mansfield | Summers, Tex. |
| Cannon | Gregory | Mead | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cartwright | Griffin | Milligan | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Christgau | Hall, Miss. | Montague | Underwood |
| Clark, N. C. | Hancock, N. C. | Montet | Vinson, Ga. |
| Collier | Hare | Moore, Va. | Warren |
| Collins | Hastings | Nelson, Mo. | Whitehead |
| Condon | Hill, Ala. | Nelson, Wis. | Whittington |
| Connery | Hill, Wash. | Norton | Wilson |
| Cooper, Tenn. | Howard | O'Connor, La. | Wingo |
| Cooper, Wis. | Huddleston | O'Connor, N. Y. | Woodrum |
| Craddock | Hull, Tenn. | Oldfield | Wright |
| Crisp | Hull, Wis. | Oliver, Ala. | Yon |
| Cross | James, N. C. | Palmisano | Zihlman |
| Crosser | Jeffers | Parks | |
| Davis | Johnson, Okla. | Parsons | |
| Denison | Johnson, Tex. | Patman | |

NAYS—212

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman | Culkin | Holaday | Morehead |
| Adkins | Dallinger | Hooper | Morgan |
| Aldrich | Darrow | Hope | Mouser |
| Allen | Davenport | Hopkins | Murphy |
| Andresen | De Priest | Hudson | Nelson, Me. |
| Andrew | Dickinson | Hull, Morton D. | Nowhall |
| Arentz | Dowell | Hull, William E. | Nolan |
| Bacharach | Dunbar | Irwin | O'Connor, Okla. |
| Bachmann | Dyer | Johnson, Ind. | Palmer |
| Bacon | Eaton, Colo. | Johnson, Nebr. | Parker |
| Beedy | Eaton, N. J. | Johnston, Mo. | Perkins |
| Beers | Elliott | Jonas, N. C. | Pratt, Ruth |
| Blackburn | Ellis | Kading | Pritchard |
| Bohn | Englebright | Kahn | Purnell |
| Bolton | Erk | Kendall, Ky. | Ramey, Frank M. |
| Bowman | Estep | Kendall, Pa. | Ramseyer |
| Brigham | Fish | Ketcham | Ransley |
| Britten | Fort | Kiefner | Reece |
| Brumm | Foss | Kinzer | Reed, N. Y. |
| Buchanan | Free | Knutson | Relly |
| Buckbee | Freeman | Kopp | Robinson |
| Burdick | French | Korell | Rogers |
| Burtness | Gavagan | Kurtz | Schafer, Wis. |
| Butler | Gibson | Lankford, Va. | Seger |
| Campbell, Pa. | Gifford | Leavitt | Selberling |
| Carter, Calif. | Goodwin | Leech | Selvig |
| Carter, Wyo. | Goss | Lehlbach | Shaffer, Va. |
| Chalmers | Graham | Letts | Short, Mo. |
| Chase | Guyer | Looibourow | Shott, W. Va. |
| Chindblom | Hadley | Luce | Shreve |
| Chiperfield | Hale | McClintock, Ohio | Simmons |
| Christopherson | Hall, Ill. | McCormick, Ill. | Simms |
| Clague | Hall, Ind. | McLaughlin | Sloan |
| Clancy | Hall, N. Dak. | McLeod | Smith, Idaho |
| Clarke, N. Y. | Halsey | Maas | Snell |
| Cochran, Pa. | Hancock, N. Y. | Magrady | Snow |
| Cole | Hartley | Manlove | Sparks |
| Colton | Haugen | Mapes | Speaks |
| Connolly | Hawley | Martin | Sproul, Ill. |
| Cooper, Ohio | Hess | Menges | Sproul, Kans. |
| Coyle | Hickey | Merritt | Stafford |
| Crail | Hoch | Michener | Stalker |
| Cramton | Hogg, Ind. | Miller | Stobbs |
| Crowther | Hogg, W. Va. | Moore, Ohio | Strong, Kans. |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strong, Pa. | Thurston | Wainwright | Wigglesworth |
| Sullivan, Pa. | Tilson | Walker | Williamson |
| Summers, Wash. | Timberlake | Wason | Wolfenden |
| Swanson | Tinkham | Watres | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Swick | Treadway | Watson | Wolverton, W. Va. |
| Swing | Tucker | Welch, Calif. | Wood |
| Taber | Underhill | Welsh, Pa. | Woodruff |
| Temple | Vestal | White | Wurzback |
| Thatcher | Vincent, Mich. | Whitley | Wyant |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cochran, Mo.

NOT VOTING—69

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Baird | Doutrich | James, Mich. | Pratt, Harcourt J. |
| Barbour | Doyle | Jenkins | Rayburn |
| Beck | Esterly | Johnson, Ill. | Reid, Ill. |
| Boylan | Evans, Calif. | Johnson, S. Dak. | Rich |
| Brand, Ohio | Fenn | Johnson, Wash. | Rowbottom |
| Brunner | Fitzgerald | Kearns | Sabath |
| Cable | Fitzpatrick | Kelly | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Carley | Frear | Kunz | Stroich |
| Celler | Fulmer | Lee | Stevenson |
| Clark, Md. | Garber, Va. | McFadden | Sullivan, N. Y. |
| Cooke | Garrett | McMillan | Tarver |
| Corning | Gasque | Michaelson | Thompson |
| Cox | Golder | Mooney | Turpin |
| Cullen | Hardy | Moore, Ky. | Williams |
| Dempsey | Hoffman | Niedringhaus | Yates |
| Dickstein | Houston, Del. | Oliver, N. Y. | |
| Douglas, Ariz. | Hudspeth | Owen | |
| Douglass, Mass. | Igoe | Pou | |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cochran of Missouri (for) with Mr. Niedringhaus (against).
 Mr. James of Michigan (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
 Mr. Carley (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).
 Mr. Cullen (for) with Mr. Evans of California (against).
 Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Johnson of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Brunner (for) with Mr. Hoffman (against).
 Mr. Sullivan of New York (for) with Mr. Hardy (against).
 Mr. Oliver of New York (for) with Mr. Turpin (against).
 Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt (against).
 Mr. Pou (for) with Mr. Beck (against).
 Mr. Tarver (for) with Mr. Fenn (against).
 Mr. Igoe (for) with Mr. Golder (against).
 Mr. Stevenson (for) with Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (against).
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).
 Mr. Sabath (for) with Mr. Sanders of New York (against).
 Mr. Fulmer (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Kearns (against).
 Mr. Williams (for) with Mr. Rich (against).
 Mr. Garrett (for) with Mr. Esterly (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Frear with Mr. Cox.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Moore of Kentucky.
 Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Rayburn.
 Mr. Garber of Virginia with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS, is absent on account of illness. If he were here, he would vote "no."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MOONEY, was called from the city a few moments ago.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKEOWN moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 144 with the following amendment: Page 129, line 16, strike out all of line 16 to and including line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 to be immediately available to be placed to the credit of the War Department for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency by advancing to community charitable organizations of reputable standing, willing and able to distribute to those who are needy, such food, medicine, and other articles essential to afford adequate human relief, and to advance upon open account necessary food, medicine, or other articles essential to afford human relief to such citizens as shall be indorsed as honorable persons by any reputable, charitable organization, approved by the War Department."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were ayes 91 and noes 220.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUDDLESTON moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: Substitute for the

language of the Senate amendment the following: "That the sum of \$50,000,000 is hereby appropriated, to be available until July 1, 1931, to the President of the United States for disbursement by him, at his discretion, for the relief of persons residing in the United States who may be in need of the necessities of life. In disbursing the said sum the President shall have authority to use and employ such agencies as he may create for that purpose or as may already exist in communities, and may cooperate with States, counties, and municipalities upon such terms and conditions as he may deem best, and may disburse same either in the purchase of supplies or by payments in money to the beneficiaries."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were ayes 88 and noes 223.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] to disagree to Senate amendment No. 144.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were ayes 224 and noes 90.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement all other amendments were disagreed to and the Chair appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CRAMTON, MURPHY, FRENCH, TAYLOR of Colorado, and HASTINGS.

APPROPRIATION FOR DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a great many Members of the House have requested an opportunity to speak on this matter and it has been impossible to grant the request. I ask unanimous consent that all parties have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the subject of to-day's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five days in which to extend their own remarks upon the subject of to-day's proceedings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we are considering to-day, in my opinion, the most meritorious piece of legislation that has been proposed in this Congress which is authorizing making an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross for the relief of suffering humanity in the United States, caused by the drought of last year.

There are 5,000,000 people to-day suffering for the want of food and clothing which could be relieved and helped by this important legislation. There is no agency that has ever been set up in the United States for the relief of humanity that has been more effective in its work than the Red Cross work, and never before in its history has it ever taken a task as great as the one it now has on its hands. I doubt seriously if the Red Cross even now appreciates fully the extent of what their work is going to be before it is finished during the year of 1931.

We were told by the Red Cross workers some time ago that \$4,500,000 that they had on hand was a sufficient fund of money to relieve all the distress they would have to deal with. As soon as they began to make a survey of the situation and saw the great need they then changed their opinion as to their ability to cope with it, and asked for a donation of \$10,000,000 for their purpose.

Strong pressure has been brought to bear and the ablest speakers in the United States have been appealing for Red Cross funds for many days, and yet not one-half of that sum has been contributed. It is not because they are not in sympathy with those that are suffering, but it is largely their inability to come to the rescue of people that are suffering.

I would be very much surprised if Mr. John Barton Payne, for whom I have always had the highest personal regard, for both his intellect and integrity, should discourage the United States Government with its millions of wealth, coming to the rescue of its own people as they have come to the rescue of people of other nations when in distress. The tender of this amount of money to the Red Cross does not mean they will necessarily have to administer it all, but it does place them in a position that they can take care of

everyone that is needy that come under their observation in the work. If the money is not needed by them, of course, they would not expend it. It takes care of them if they should run out of funds and they would not have to make another call in trying to procure funds in the manner that they are now trying to procure funds by donations so this would relieve any emergency that comes on and they will have funds available and in their hands to take care of the needs of every suffering person in the United States.

A blunder was made by the leaders of the party in power by restricting and limiting the \$45,000,000 loan to the purchase of seed and feed for work stock, fuel for tractors, and a few things like that, and not allowing any part of the money to be applied for food. If this restriction had not been placed in that bill, then the Red Cross work might be able to cease early in the year; but with this restriction in the bill, after the farmer has given his first lien in order to procure feed for his stock and nothing for himself, then he has no means of procuring food for himself and family, and would necessarily have to appeal to an agency like the Red Cross or other agency for help; and this ought not be required of him.

I think that Congress should pass an act now amending the act authorizing the loan of \$45,000,000, and take off this restriction, which would very much relieve the work of the Red Cross.

The work of the Red Cross, instead of ending with the 1st of April as indicated by some of its workers, will not end before the 1st of July, because everyone knows that crops can not be made by the 1st of April, or any crop on which they might live or use by that time.

I am informed that the statement was made by Mr. Payne that the Red Cross would not administer this fund if given to them. If the Red Cross should decline to use it, then another agency should be set up immediately whereby it can be disbursed and used by those so badly in need of it.

The farmers of the South are brave, honest, and courageous. They would very much prefer this being given to them as a loan without restrictions and later repay it to the Government than to have any part of same given to them in this way. People who are now receiving aid from the Red Cross have in the past for many years been strong contributors to it, and if they are permitted to make another crop this year many of them will repay every dollar they have received from the Red Cross, in order that it may relieve others in distress in the future.

Let us pass this bill and every other measure that will aid in restoring normal conditions in the drought-stricken areas, and have produced during this coming year a bountiful crop. Let us pass this bill and make the funds available for the Red Cross and put the responsibility of relieving the suffering on them and let no part of it rest on any Member of Congress for failing to do his duty in providing the funds necessary for them to give this relief.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this appropriation. If the Red Cross will not agree to distribute the money, then I say let us find some other agency that will, preferably the President or some other Government agency, but if it is the wisdom of the Congress that State agencies should be selected I will favor that, just so the relief is extended to the suffering people of this country. The \$25,000,000 should be appropriated.

This is not an overnight proposition. No farmer will be able to take any food from his soil at least until May and others must wait until June, July, and August. Until then these suffering people must be cared for and the undertaking is too great to be properly accomplished by popular subscription.

The people of the cities who give so freely not only for their own neighbors but also to help the farmer can not stand the strain much longer.

While some frank statements have come from the Red Cross concerning conditions, the worst has not been told. This is beyond doubt the greatest emergency, the greatest crisis that has confronted the country since its very existence, the period following the Civil War included.

Let me give you a little first-hand information. It comes to me from a responsible citizen of my city, a constituent of mine, who sends me a letter from his daughter residing in southeast Missouri. The people of Missouri, 50,000, according to the last report of the Red Cross in southeast Missouri, are in the same condition as the people in Arkansas and other States. The daughter of my constituent, after thanking her father for a check, says eggs now sell at 15 cents a dozen, while they brought 35 and 40 cents last year, and the hens are not laying due to the cold weather. She says her husband is working a day or two a week for \$1.50 a day, while two other male members of the household are cutting wood and fence posts, but there is no sale at any price for the wood or posts. She speaks of the children attending school and tells how they bring for lunch a raw turnip or two; some of the children so poorly clothed that she wonders how they can continue at their studies.

They have even been forced to let the insurance they have carried for many years lapse because no funds are available to pay the premiums. She tells how a man and his wife and three children without food were given \$1.15 by the Red Cross representative for 30 days. She tells her father he has no idea of the conditions in that country with the crops a total failure, and says that God knows they are willing to do or skimp in anyway to get by, but just now in the dead of winter the situation looks hopeless. They try not to get discouraged just hoping they can get through until they can grow another crop. They can not drive their car because they have no money to buy gasoline, and from her letter one must judge that the Red Cross will help no one who owns an automobile. She says the people can not sell their cars as no one has any money to buy them.

This letter comes from one who is receiving financial assistance from her father, what he can spare helping them to exist. What must it be for those who have no relatives to help?

This legislation might set a precedent, but I say set the precedent as it has been demonstrated it is necessary in order to keep our people from starving not only in the rural sections but in the cities. Over 60,000 people—and this is a most conservative estimate—are out of work in my city, St. Louis. Multiply this by four, an average family, and you have 240,000 people without the necessary funds to purchase the necessities of life. Throughout the country you have 20,000,000 in the same situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, owing to the necessity of attendance upon important hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, it was impossible for me to be present during the debate in the House regarding the Senate item appropriating \$25,000,000 to be expended by the American Red Cross.

In the effort to attach this item to the Interior Department appropriation bill we have an illustration of the worst type of playing politics with human suffering. The advocates of this item in the Senate so clearly show their political slant that no one can be deceived as to the actual purpose of their effort.

Dire threats are made that a special session of the Seventy-second Congress looms unless certain politicians have their way. For my part, such a session could be called on March 5 and continue until December before I could be forced to vote for legislation of this sort.

Not only this country but the entire world is proud of the accomplishments of the Red Cross. No other organization exists similar to it. It occupies a most unique position in the realm of relief of human suffering. The organization is nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and universal in its charity.

The Red Cross obtains its funds through appeals to the humanitarian instincts of the people. Any departure from this method would be disastrous to the organization. Perhaps the most unfortunate and damaging feature of this whole affair is the charge made in certain quarters that Judge John Barton Payne, the chairman of the Red Cross, is playing politics when he says that his organization would decline to receive or administer funds appropriated by Congress.

The life of the Red Cross is at stake. It has been supported over a long period of years by the voluntary offerings of the people. A congressional appropriation with a political background, if accepted by the Red Cross, would mean a withdrawal of the type of support upon which the organization has thrived over so long a period of years.

The fact that the people of the country do not believe in changing the method of providing funds for the Red Cross is shown by the response now being made to the appeal of the organization for \$10,000,000. In spite of the tremendous handicap which has been imposed by certain politicians in the other branch, there has already been subscribed the sum of \$4,680,163.

Now that one branch of Congress has shown its stamina by refusing, by a vote of 217 to 151, to carry out the effort to play politics with the Red Cross, rapid increases in the contributions may be expected.

The work of the Red Cross must go on in the manner in which it has been conducted since its inception so successfully, and politicians, even though they are Members of Congress, must be taught that human welfare must take precedence over political expediency. The vote of the House is most encouraging. The attitude of the administration and the officers of the Red Cross is likewise most commendable. The people will show their confidence in the Red Cross by hearty cooperation and generous contributions.

The suffering in the drought area is being relieved and will continue to be relieved by a nonpartisan humanitarian organization of which the world is proud, an organization which has always been and always will be supported by the voluntary aid of the people.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is now February. Congress has been in session two months, and no legislation of importance has been passed, not even a single one of the appropriation bills. A deadlock exists between the Congress and the President. The country is wallowing in such a slough of despond as never before existed. People in at least 21 States are on the verge of starvation, and the administration and Congress fiddle while the people starve. Let us analyze the situation.

We find that the administration is unalterably opposed to any direct Federal relief to the men, women, and children who are the innocent victims of this economic disaster. We find likewise, as has been demonstrated here, that the administration has refused to permit the Congress to give any direct relief even in the form of loans for the purchase of food for those who are suffering in the drought-stricken areas.

The leadership in Congress, if any exists, should devote itself to the development of a program which will adequately meet this situation. First of all, we should see that food and clothing are provided for the drought sufferers. To throw the entire burden on the Red Cross and to permit conditions to develop such as have been pictured here is criminal negligence on the part of those in control of the Government.

We are confronted with evidence—which, so far as I have been able to discover, is uncontradicted—that large sections of our country contain inhabitants the majority of whom do not have enough to eat and have no way of obtaining food to sustain human life. Men, women, and children are suffering over a territory that is much larger than the thirteen original States. When people, especially little children, are suffering for the necessities of life, the first thing to do is to bring relief, and it seems to me that that can be brought about most appropriately by appropriating money from the Federal Treasury. In fact, as I see it, on account of the magnitude of the suffering, that is the only real way to meet the situation. How anyone can close his mind and close his heart to the appeals coming from all over the country for relief from human suffering and say, "We will give relief to animals but not to people" is more than I can understand or comprehend.

It is said it would establish a bad precedent. Suppose it does? Are we going to let people die of starvation because it may establish a precedent that will be difficult to over-

come in the future? If it is necessary, which it is not, we ought to establish the precedent that we are not immune to appeals because of human suffering. We ought to establish the precedent that we are human beings and that the Government of the United States is human and is moved by the appeals of human suffering. Such action is not without precedent. We have scores of precedents for appropriating money directly from the Treasury, not alone for our own people but for people of foreign countries.

In 1905 we appropriated \$1,000,000 for the relief of sufferers from fire at San Francisco, Calif., and that was not enough; later on the Congress appropriated another million and a half for those who suffered, those who had neither food nor clothes.

In the year 1909 an appropriation of \$800,000 was made for the relief of citizens of Italy. They were suffering, they needed food and clothing, and the American Congress, with the approval of an American President with a heart in him, sent \$800,000 to far-off Italy to relieve human suffering, and it ought to have been sent.

In 1911 we made an appropriation for the relief of the sufferers from famine in China. We have made no distinction of race or color. But when it comes to American children, American men, and American women who are suffering the administration uses every instrumentality in its power to prevent Congress from exercising its constitutional right to relieve suffering.

Let me see if there were any more precedents. In 1908 we appropriated \$250,000 for the relief of suffering from cyclones in the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee.

Again in 1913—and we well remember this, because many of us were in Congress at that time, in one branch or the other—for the relief of the sufferers from floods in the Mississippi Valley we appropriated \$1,239,000. In 1914, again, we made another appropriation of \$250,000 for the same purpose.

Throughout our entire history we have relieved want and suffering not only in our own land but in almost every land on the face of the earth, and I might say in every land on the face of the earth, where it was needed.

Why should not our Government take part in a situation like this? Heaven knows such a call does not come often. Heaven knows that the prosperity in this country of ours is such ordinarily that action like this on the part of Congress is not necessary. We have the money. There is no question about the money. There is no reason in the world why this should not be done except a fear on the part of somebody that his taxes might be raised a little. Why should not a man with a large income, who does not know what it is to want bread and meat, be compelled by the Government to give out of his great wealth a little more in taxes in order that those who are hungry, due to no fault of theirs, should be fed? The Congress has appropriated \$45,000,000 to loan farmers for feed, seed, and fertilizer, taking mortgages on his prospective crop, but still refuses him money for food for himself and his starving children.

I want to stress the fact that the farmers are not beggars. They are independent men. When conditions are normal, when the seasons are anything like normal, they are able to maintain themselves and their families. But here is a drought, an act of God for which they are not responsible. Is our great Government going to play politics while its citizens are in distress and in want and hungry?

Mr. Speaker, imagine the scene as it will appear to citizens in distress when this agency shall have been set up. Here is the loan agent of the Government, with money from the Treasury of the United States. Here is an applicant who says, "I want to borrow some money with which to make a crop for 1931." The agent replies, "Well, my friend, have you a mule?" "Yes." "Well, bring him up, the Government will lend you money to feed your mule." But the applicant says, "O Mr. Government Agent, I have also a child." "Well, I am sorry," says the Government agent, "I will loan you money to feed your mule, but I will not loan you money to feed your child."

Mr. Speaker, why is not money loaned to feed a mule just as much a dole as would be money loaned to feed a wife and children? It is said money loaned for the latter purpose is a dole. Well, if that be a dole, then it is also a dole to loan money to feed hogs and chickens and cows and mules and horses.

With unaccountable stupidity, this legislation was denounced as a dole and rejected; and everywhere we hear highbrows declaring their opposition to the dole, just as if a charity from the Government is any more a dole than a charity through the Red Cross. Of course, Red Cross dole is not Government dole; but any form of charity is a dole.

Now, we hear that it is unsound policy to make appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the relief of peoples in widespread areas when local organizations are unable to meet the requirements. I want to call to attention the view expressed by the present President when he came before the committees of Congress appealing in the name of the Russian people, appealing in the name of the peoples of Europe, that the United States Government participate in feeding those peoples, and I wish to show that he thought then that the conditions were such that charitable organizations should not be even asked to carry on this task.

In 1921 there was pending a resolution to appropriate \$20,000,000, not to buy feed for mules, cattle, and pigs, but to buy food for people. It is true those people were not living in America; they were not of our own flesh and blood; they were not our own kinsmen; they were not our own constituents; they were not citizens who had some rights to look to this Government for generous treatment or even for its bounty; they were people living in Russia. At that time there appeared before the committee the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Herbert Hoover. He appeared there in advocacy of an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to feed hungry Russians, hungry Bolsheviks, hungry men with long whiskers and wild ideas. The appropriation was made. Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, said:

The problem that we are confronting is not a problem of general relief for Russia, for which there can be some criticism, but is a problem of relief to an area suffering from an acute drought.

The reason for according relief to Russia was not because we wanted to help Bolsheviks but it was because a certain area of Russia had been stricken with drought. What is there about a drought in Russia that distinguishes it from a drought in the United States? Does the sun get any hotter in Russia? Does the ground become any more parched in Russia? Does the grass dry up any more quickly in Russia?

In other words, we are making a distinction here between the situation created by the hand of man as distinguished from the situation that might be called an act of God.

In 1921 it was sound and safe to vote money to give away because of a drought in Russia. It was sound then to give it away because it had been caused—not by act of man—but by an act of God.

What else was said? The Secretary of Commerce then said:

Public charity is not to be an avenue through which this problem can be solved.

In 1921 public charity ought not to have been relied upon to raise \$20,000,000. It was not to be resorted to in this gigantic undertaking to feed a little area of the Russian people. It was going to require something more than private charity. Again quoting:

It does not look to be a very great strain on the population to take \$20,000,000 for a purpose of this kind.

That was good doctrine in 1921. What has happened—what has happened in the morals of nations, what has happened in the philosophical aspect of government—that between 1921 and 1931 we should have an absolute reversal of our attitude upon these questions?

Again he said:

If our own people suffer, we surely possess the resources to care for them.

How has our financial position changed since 1921? If we had the resources then to care for Russia as well as for ourselves, why have we not the resources now to care for ourselves, why have we not the resources now to care for our own people, when Russia is making no demand upon our bounty of our charity?

Quoting again:

I have a feeling we are dealing to-day with a situation of a great deal of depression and have a proper right to inquire not only whether we are doing an act of great humanity but whether we are doing an act of economic soundness. To me, after assessing our ability to give, no other argument is needed beyond the sheer humanity.

In 1921 there were only two considerations—one was our ability to give, the other the question of sheer humanity. Our ability is greater now. The dictates of sheer humanity ought to be greater now. These are our own people. These are the citizens of our own Republic. The Secretary of Commerce advocated this then not only as an act of humanity but as an economic measure. He said that food products were cheap; the farmers were depressed; we were in a period of great depression, and spending \$20,000,000 for food would help the farmers of the United States. How has that argument changed with the years? Mr. Speaker, I submit that those arguments and those sentiments were good in 1921. They ought to be good now.

The appropriation of \$20,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States for relief purposes in Russia was justified as sound in economics, but any appropriation is condemned as violative of sound economics if made for the benefit of people who paid into the Treasury of the United States the money out of which the appropriation is to be made.

In 1921 the American Congress unhesitatingly voted the sum of \$20,000,000 for food to relieve the starving millions of Russia, and immediately following the holocaust of the World War its sympathy for Europe's unhappy peoples took the tangible form of an appropriation of \$100,000,000. This vast sum of ready relief money was placed at the disposal of Mr. Herbert Hoover, our President, for disbursement, and instantly he assumed world-noticing proportions as "the man who fed starving Europe."

The late official reports received at the Washington headquarters of the American Red Cross suffice to impress deeper upon the hearts and minds of our people the suffering endured by thousands of helpless and all but hopeless men, women, and children as famine stalks undefined through pitilessly parched areas. To the Congress of the United States these terror-stricken people have turned their gaunt faces in the despairing hope that they may be saved, even at this late hour, from a fate which the Government has averted in foreign lands.

We are told in news dispatches that starving refugees are fleeing from wrecked farms in the 21 drought States.

The Washington Star a few days ago carried an Associated Press story from Marvell, Ark., from which I quote:

"A drought sufferer's family gets out of what the Red Cross gives him, but we are thankful to get that, because it keeps us from starving," said Jacob Miller, a colored tenant farmer and life-long resident of the community. "About all it does is to keep us alive, though." Miller's case is typical of that of most of the tenant farmers of this and other counties, whites and colored alike. He has a wife and two children and has been receiving food from the Red Cross for three weeks. It amounts to about \$5. "We eat one meal a day," he said; "if we try to get any more than that out of the food we get it would not last two weeks. The food is allotted every two weeks. We do not get enough at one meal. If I ate all I wanted, there would not be any left for my family, so lots of times I do without. The people over here, both white and colored persons, have just about killed all of their hogs that did not die. I lost five hogs and was afraid to eat them. I know of lots of others who have lost their hogs. I do not know what was the matter with them. I suppose it was because they hadn't gotten the right kind or enough food. Now people are going to have to kill their cows, as poor as they are, to get enough to eat."

Quoting again:

One meal a day, consisting usually of bread and molasses and perhaps beans and plain salt pork.

Do you know this meal is so meager, so scant, that it costs less than 3 cents, less than 9 cents per day to the person.

Less than 9 cents a day to feed an American citizen. Do you know that we have just voted for and supported a bill that paid for the meals of convicts in the Federal penitentiaries 29 cents a day? We propose, my friends, to feed these American citizens who contributed the best bone and blood and sinew for the preservation of this Nation at the rate of less than 3 cents a meal? Do you mean to tell me they are mendicants of so low order that the people of the United States can not afford to pay over 3 cents a meal to keep soul and body together?

By this statement I do not mean to criticize the Red Cross. I say frankly that the money that they have at their disposal will not prove sufficient to meet the situation. Arkansas has the center of the stage right now; but do you think that you are not going to hear from Kentucky and Oklahoma? Before the sun goes down on February 10 you will be feeding one-fourth of the population of the State of Arkansas, or 500,000 people, and I was reliably informed by a distinguished gentleman from Kentucky the other day that you would be feeding 500,000 more people in Kentucky before February 10. That makes 1,000,000 people you have to feed in those 2 States alone out of the 21, and you are going to feed them because that is what you want to do and what the American people want to do. If the American people knew the real condition we would be deluged with protests at the delay in making the necessary appropriation. Unfortunately the administration and the leaders of this House who speak for the administration are opposed to any and all such appropriations.

In speaking of some of the proposed appropriations the President said:

Some of these schemes are ill considered, some represent enthusiasm, some represent a desire of individuals to show that they are more generous than the administration.

If one be in favor of feeding a single child who is starving, he would be more generous than the administration if he is in favor of feeding it out of public funds. The President further states:

They are playing politics at the expense of human misery.

According to that, any man who is more generous in providing relief for starving people than are the leaders of the party or the administration is "playing politics." Is it playing politics to want to feed the hungry when the administration does not want to feed them? Is it playing politics to want to appropriate money to feed those who are starving when the leaders of one's party are opposed to doing so? I wonder if we have reached a time when a Member of Congress dare not say that he is in favor of this or that legislation without being charged with "playing politics," because it is alleged that the leaders of the parties do not want it? Are we going so far as to say that the rank and file of the membership of the Congress have no right to express their own opinions? Must they first go and seek out the leader and ask him whether or not they have a right to think?

In the debate in this House it is said the proponents of this relief legislation were trying to "assassinate the Red Cross." That the "Red Cross was struggling for its life" because of this proposed legislation. I deny both statements. I deny that any Member of this House is in any way opposed to the Red Cross. Since the morning stars sang together no human being has done so much for suffering humanity as that immortal woman, Clara Barton, who founded the Red Cross. We know what the record of the Red Cross has been. No private organization for the relief of distress in all the centuries has equaled the record of this organization, and we all know it.

I favor the preferential motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] because it appears to me it solves completely this question. It gets us out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves now, and it enables the Red Cross to escape from the unfortunate position it occupies at the present time by reason of the inexplicable statement given out recently by some of the officers of the Red Cross to the effect that funds from the Treasury would not be accepted by the organization. If the organization has been crippled

or hurt, the blow came not from Congress but from its own officers. Who authorized these officers to refuse the largess of a grateful and generous Nation to feed a group of hungry citizens? The President of the United States is also the president of the Red Cross. Is it possible that he joins in the decision that as president of that great charitable organization he would not accept or distribute funds supplied by the Congress of the United States? Many men in this House, including myself, voted \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury to feed starving Europeans; and we put that money in the hands of Herbert Hoover, now President of the United States and president of the Red Cross; and he accepted and distributed it, and by so doing rose from comparative obscurity to the Presidency of the United States. I can not believe he has more sympathy for starving people in Russia than for starving people in America. The future alone will determine. No, Mr. Speaker, the Red Cross is neither dead nor dying; it is a strong, vigorous, virile organization; it will live as long as there is milk of human kindness in the hearts of men. When the Red Cross falls prostrate the American people will say:

Let not Caesar's servile minions
Mock the lion thus laid low;
'Twas no foeman's arm that felled him
'Twas his own that struck the blow.

Mr. ESCLICK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, my district is situated south and west of Nashville, Tenn. It is one of the richest farming sections in the world. Heretofore my people have not only produced plenty for their needs but they have had large quantities of provisions and foodstuffs for sale. The panic, commonly called "the depression," vitally affected my people. The year 1930 brought them very low prices, indeed. The prices, compared to normal times, have been about one-half. The drought came to us and practically destroyed not only the crops but all vegetation and pastures. This is the first time in my life that I have known hungry people in the country sections of my district, people without food and clothing. Heretofore when the calls for relief throughout the country have been made, my people have been able to respond, and they have contributed bountifully of their means to the public, patriotic, and charitable causes.

The situation is different now. My country is largely under mortgage; credits are gone; a number of banks have failed; there have been many business failures; and many of the landowners, both small and large, have not the provisions nor supplies to make a crop this year, and they can not obtain the credit. I do not believe that Tennessee is in as serious condition as Arkansas, Kentucky, and Oklahoma; but it is a fearful situation. Many, many families, both in the country and in the towns, are in dire distress. They have never known what it was to have contributions made to them. They are a proud people—many of them willing to starve rather than ask for help. Our State is not financially in position to take care of these people. The Red Cross is contributing in a few counties in Tennessee. At the present time only two counties in my district are receiving Red Cross aid.

The question of aid to people in the drought-stricken sections should not be a political question nor should it be made an issue. It is the duty of the Government to take care of its people and to see that they do not starve nor freeze. Generally speaking, the hungry men and women do not ask, "Whence comes the food?" It is a question of aiding them in the time of greatest distress.

This calamity is probably greater than the calamity of war. To say the least of it, it is the greatest call for charitable aid in the time of peace that has ever come to the American people. I am deeply appreciative of the fact that the American Red Cross has been the greatest charitable agency in the world. I have an abiding faith in the 3,500 Red Cross chapters of the country—much greater faith than I have in the 11 members of the board who turned their backs upon the \$25,000,000 which the Senate sought to contribute to that great organization for the relief of the distressed people throughout the land. This distress is not alone in the drought-stricken sections. Of course, the

drought has added much to the misery of that distressing situation. It is estimated that there are five and one-half million of people out of employment in the land. It is safe to say, all told, that there are about 20,000,000 people unemployed, with their dependents constituting the families of the unemployed.

In my section, if the panic had not taken away values, destroyed markets, and depleted the savings of the people, we could have weathered the storm caused by the drought; but the one coming upon the other has made a situation which the local communities and the people of the State can not overcome.

I have heard men on the floor of the House tell of how great cities raised their millions and cared for the poor and distressed. That is true; but the people of the drought-stricken areas can not do this. The wealth of the land has gone. It has been gathered into the cities. Many men of large means are willing to contribute; but the people of the drought-stricken areas simply have not the means, nor the credit to get the means, to contribute to the hungry and starving people of this immense territory. Many men who have heretofore been able to contribute are now in need of help.

The chairman of the Red Cross told the Senate committee on January 6 that the Red Cross's \$5,000,000 was adequate for the drought relief. A few days later he made a call for an additional \$10,000,000. The Red Cross already has \$20,000,000. As I understand, this fund is kept in reserve for such emergencies as this one. If the Red Cross is to take care of this situation, why does it not meet it now instead of saving for some other emergency that shall arise in the future? This is the greatest need in time of peace that has ever confronted that great organization. The challenge is here now. Why wait for the disaster of to-morrow?

If we see a man drowning, making the last desperate effort for his life, humanity would offer to save that man. It would not be a question of the method but the means, whether it should be by extending a pole, a rope, or a boat, or plunging in and taking perils in an effort to save him.

These very families in distress contributed their sons to the American Army as offerings on the western front to save the civilization of the world. The folks back home, of their means and through their taxes, contributed to the \$100,000,000 appropriated February 25, 1919, as a revolving fund for furnishing foodstuffs to the hungry people of Europe. Through their Representatives in Congress they supported the act of March 30, 1920, authorizing the United States Grain Corporation to sell 5,000,000 barrels of flour for cash or credit to relieve the populations in Europe. These people saw the American Congress, by act of December 22, 1921, send \$20,000,000 of funds of the United States Grain Corporation for purchase and distribution of corn, seed, grain, and preserved milk for the people of Russia. They applauded the act of January 20, 1922, when Congress authorized the transfer of \$4,000,000 worth of surplus medical supplies to American organizations for Russian relief. Then in 1921 they saw the American Congress, moved by the great heart of the people of this country, send \$10,000,000 to feed the hungry women and children of Germany, recently vanquished. And again in 1924, on February 24, more than \$6,000,000 in the issue of supplies was given to the earthquake sufferers in Japan.

They know that the moving spirit in the larger part of this legislation, and in the distribution of the food to the unfortunate peoples of the other nations of the earth, was the present President of the United States. They know that the fame and history by which he shall live was made in this humanitarian work.

The millions of people who are out of employment and out of means, whether in or out of the drought districts, know that the policies advocated by the great humanitarian in the leadership of this Nation has contributed largely in bringing about the disaster which has destroyed American business and American commerce. If there had been no drought, the economic situation had put its millions out of employment, and distress would have existed anyway in the country; but with the contributed disaster of a great drought

unprecedented in our history, it made a situation with such large numbers of people in distress that no single charitable organization can handle it. It is a national problem. It calls for all of the charity and benevolence, both private and public, of city, State, and Nation, that is at the command of the American people. It is a supreme challenge to the heart of the American people. This situation calls for all of the funds, whether contributed by individuals, the Red Cross, or the Nation; and we who have seen the generosity of this Nation shown to the hungry people of the Old World wonder why it is that our women and children, without fault on their part, come with outstretched hands to the Congress of the United States and say, "We are hungry and need your help," get the answer that we can not feed you because it means to adopt the dole system in the United States.

I know every man who has studied this question in the least realizes that the Red Cross is unable to cope with this situation. It may use its funds available, and then if the ten millions asked for in the present drive is contributed, it is but a pittance, and can last but a little while. The \$25,000,000 involved in this bill, combined with the funds of the Red Cross, is not half enough to meet the emergency and to fulfill the duty that we owe to the hungry men, women, and children of the land.

I saw a bill passed which carried feed to the work stock, but no food to the human workers. I saw the "hunger" part of the bill stricken out, and in a little while I saw an authorization of \$15,000,000 to build roads to the entrance of the Federal parks of the country. I saw an item embraced in an appropriation bill for \$125,000 as a contribution to the embassies for tips and flowers. I saw another bill pass authorizing the construction of a building to house butterflies and bugs that cost some millions of dollars. They call it a museum. And we would put from twenty-five to forty million dollars in a single battleship. We can authorize the expenditure of more than \$300,000,000 for public buildings in the city of Washington alone; and yet when hungry men, women, and children come staggering to the door of Congress—American citizens, good, loyal, and true—those who have been overtaken by misfortune through no fault of their own, and they ask of the great mother that they may be fed and clothed until they can obtain work and earn an honest living, they are told that there is not a dollar in the American Treasury that will be contributed to them.

We talk about our great Nation; and it is a great nation because its people are great. A nation is only a collection of individuals. These unfortunate people, hungry and some of them down and out, without any fault of their own, they are part of the great American family. Shall we disown them? If we follow the President, it is an accomplished fact.

We talk about the reds of the country. Failure to take care of these people will make more resentful people with less regard for our organized society and Government than all the subversive dealings of that alien organization. The caretaker of our civilization has been the countryman. Riots, disturbances, and revolutions do not come from the country; they belong to the congested centers. When the honest hard-working man reaches the time in life that without fault upon his part he is deprived of his work and an honest living, when his means are exhausted, when the withering summer suns have destroyed his crops, and the little ones about him are hungry and crying for bread, which he can not give to them, and which the organized society of Government, speaking through its Congress, denies to him, it makes a dangerous and a desperate man. The greatest cure for the unrest of the millions of people of this country is to give them something to eat and a job.

There should be no antagonism between a Government appropriation and the Red Cross contributions. They should unite as two streams, bearing a blessed relief to the people who need it. Appropriations of Congress to the Red Cross in part payment for its buildings—\$400,000 in one instance and \$350,000 in another—were not repugnant to the

board of directors. Now they refuse the Government relief offered; they will not distribute this money among the people through the organization. I am sure that where the Red Cross is operating it is doing the best at its command with its contributions, but the beneficiaries barely get a subsistence. The cost of its meals are about $2\frac{3}{4}$ cents. In Osceola, Ark., a family of 1 gets \$2.05 for two weeks' rations; a family of 2 gets \$4; 3 or 4 in a family get \$5; 5 to 7 in a family get \$6.30; 7 to 10 in a family get \$7.65. In Phillips County, Ark., a family of 1 or 2 gets \$2.50 semi-monthly; a family of 3 or 4 gets \$3.55; a family of 5 or 6 gets \$4.90. This is substantially the ratio throughout the area. A postage stamp represents almost the average meal.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble conception of the administration of governmental affairs the greatest and the highest service is the bringing of happiness and contentment to the people. I know that with a third of the population of this country in distress, with nearly half of the States of the Union embraced in the great drought area, where the people are either hungry and naked or underfed and half clothed, there can be neither happiness nor contentment. If this situation can be relieved, it should be done promptly. This is an obligation and a responsibility to those having the power to change this situation from one of hunger and desolation to at least a state of assurance that the people will not starve and they will not freeze in the bitter winter winds. Speaking for myself, I had rather vote all the money that is necessary to feed and clothe these people, the unfortunate people of my country, until they can earn an honest living than to vote for all of the battleships and public buildings this country will ever need.

The appropriations of the Seventy-first Congress have grown in nearly every department. For the purposes of war—past and present—Congress has appropriated approximately \$2,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It is 40 per cent of our total appropriations. But \$25,000,000 can not be appropriated for humanitarian purposes. It is classed in the first instance as a "dole." The "dole" does not apply to the English-speaking white man. And, again, the majority leader says it is "sticking the dagger into the heart of the Red Cross."

We have a precedent, and Congress moves by precedents. Did not the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of this House move to recommit the \$100,000,000 appropriation bill on January 13, 1919, for the purpose of feeding the hungry of Europe? The original bill provided that it should be expended under the direction of the President. The motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] was to strike out the name of the President and insert "to be expended by the American National Red Cross." And Mr. Speaker LONGWORTH, Majority Leader TILSON, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SNELL, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. HAWLEY—they were all "dagger drivers" into the heart of the Red Cross, for they voted to substitute the Red Cross for the President in this \$100,000,000 expenditure. They were using the dagger for the hungry of Europe. It is a controlling precedent, except we want to feed the home folks; but, following the present President, who distributed that large fund, they now vote against the appropriation to the Red Cross. They play with human misery, for a vote against this appropriation is a vote to continue hunger, to make the situation more acute, with disease and pestilence threatening the unfortunate people of a great area of our land.

The \$25,000,000 appropriation, measured in dollars and cents, means nothing to this administration. But it means all in another way. If, forced by human suffering and hunger, the Congress is forced to appropriate this money from the Public Treasury, it stamps the Hoover administration with absolute failure. It is the legislative admission of a fact everybody understands now. An administration that came into being on a prosperous day and in two years the Treasury had to be opened because of the conditions brought about in a large measure by the President's economic policies and lack of aggressive leadership, and amplified by the unprecedented drought. If the President had spent the last

year in warning and advising the people of what was to come, instead of trying to lull their fears and silence their calls of alarm by telling them that prosperity was just around the corner, probably a different condition would exist to-day, at least in a large part of the country. But that is past. Experience is writing the blackest chapter in our history. The President can not afford to let this history be written into law by this appropriation. It perfects the record for the future historian in telling the story of the colossal failure of Hoover and his administration.

We are used to slogans. In 1916 it was "Wilson kept us out of war." When war came, "Wilson led the way to victory." The slogan to come will be "Hoover kept us out of work, and then refused to feed us when we were cold and hungry."

I can not imagine the condition of any people greater in its appeal to the human side of the American Congress than this one. It is not a long-distance call. It is not from distant shores. The evidence is not second hand, or "hearsay." The scene is before us. The facts are known to us. If the President will not ring the bell, the House would do well to stop, look, and listen. The Senate has done its part. It is not a foreign cry of distress we hear. It is a familiar voice. A large percentage of the great American family is knocking at the door of Congress, and Congress does not invite them in. The masters who control this House, acting in accord with the President, and who fed the hungry of Belgium, Germany, Russia, Japan, and China out of our Treasury, they see the multitude—father, mother, and children. For the first time in our history they hear the native-born Anglo-Saxon American from the South and Southwest say, "We are naked; clothe us. We are hungry; give us this day our daily bread." Those who fed the hungry of Europe, in part with the taxes gathered from these very unfortunate people, answer, "We can not do it. It would be a dole and ruin you." And then the leader of his party in the House, the gentleman from Connecticut, acting as he says on principle, closes the door in their faces—the door of Hope, Faith, and Charity; and of these "is Charity the greatest."

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my first impulse under the privilege of extension of remarks on the subject of drought relief was to refrain from entering into this controversy which has now assumed such a great magnitude in current discussion throughout the United States.

The people of Massachusetts, like those of every State in the Union, are to-day suffering by reason of an "unemployment drought," and economic depression of unprecedented character which prevails throughout our Nation.

We are cognizant of the misery that stalks in many homes in our Commonwealth and the helpless state in which many of our citizens find themselves. With this knowledge of the conditions in our own State, my heart goes out to those people in the drought-stricken area which comprises 21 States in our Union, and which affects hundreds of thousands of people. This is a national calamity. One does not need to hear the whole world groan in anguish to be taught the lessons of charity.

It is serious enough that in my own State my citizens suffer from the lack of employment; it is doubly serious—yes, a catastrophe of the first order—when citizens of other States in our Union suffer untold misery not only from unemployment but by an act of God which renders them helpless in the face of famine.

Speeches have been made and many arguments have been advanced on the floor of this House against the policy of governmental appropriations for food for our people in the drought area. It is apparent that many times sympathy is cold to the relation of distant misery.

In order to understand properly the reasons for the present deadlock of the drought-appropriation measure it is necessary for us to consider the history of this legislation and the events that preceded the recommendations for relief by President Hoover. It is well known that by reason of a drought without parallel in the history of our country the people living in the drought-stricken area have been pauperized and rendered penniless. They have been reduced

to these circumstances without warning, and through no fault of their own they have been and they are to-day in a state of helplessness. Vast areas and many people have suffered.

In the late summer of 1930 President Hoover made an investigation which brought to his attention and the attention of the world a picture of distress and famine, which required governmental aid with great dispatch. It was recommended to the Congress of the United States that \$60,000,000 be appropriated as a relief fund to relieve these stricken people. That bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and it passed the Senate without a single vote of protest. It provided for an appropriation of \$60,000,000 to be loaned to the citizens of the drought-stricken area for the following purposes: Food for themselves, feed for their animals, and fertilizer and seed for their crops. Under this bill the people in this area were to receive loans in accordance with the needs of their circumstances, and in return they were to pay the Government from the money earned in the future from their crops. This is not a new practice nor a new policy of our Government. In emergencies in the past on several occasions, our Government has loaned its citizens money under a similar plan. The bill came to the House of Representatives in which the dominant party has a majority of over 100 votes. Then, let us see what happened. The appropriation was reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$30,000,000, and the item of food for the people was stricken from the bill. I voted against the motion to strike out of this bill the provision which provided food for the helpless men, women, and children of the drought-stricken area.

Being myself no stranger to suffering, I have learned to relieve the sufferings of others.

It was urged by the Members on the other side of the House that to appropriate money for food to a stricken people was a dole and that we were establishing a very bad precedent in our Government. This was not a dole. This was no gift. It was a loan to citizens in distress. It was money to be loaned to them so that they might be fed. It was money to be loaned, and a loan implies payment. Payment of a loan even to the Government does not constitute a dole in any sense of the word.

By this plan of relief our Government was not establishing a precedent. The history of our Government is generous in its disclosures of precedents. Our Government has always in times of great emergencies been the tender mother of mercy to stricken people, in whatever land they lived.

Before bringing to your attention the numerous precedents established by our Government in connection with appropriations of this character I desire first to continue with my narration of the history of this bill. However, I shall call your attention to these facts later on in my speech, which, I believe, under the circumstances will prove to be a more orderly presentation of the case.

The House by its vote reduced the appropriation to \$30,000,000 and eliminated the loan provision for food. The bill went to conference, and under the conference report \$45,000,000 was agreed to and the provision for food was eliminated from the bill. That leaves the issue plain and clear; just as plain as it is simple. Providing, as it did, \$45,000,000 to be loaned for feed for the animals, fertilizer and seeds for the land, and nothing for the starving farmer with which to feed himself, so that he in turn might feed his animals, plant his seeds, and scatter his fertilizer.

I could not persuade my mind, reinforced as it was with the knowledge of these facts, to the conviction that horses, cows, mules, and even pigs came before men, women, and children. I am first, last, and always for feeding the helpless people in the drought-stricken area. My position is tenable, and I am not forced in my search for a precedent to go very far back in the history of governmental appropriations. Our Government has frequently, willingly, and generously appropriated money from the Public Treasury to relieve starving people, not only in our own country but it has reached out its tender hands of mercy across the broad expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific to relieve distress

in foreign nations. The President of the United States, who now withholds his sanction to this legislation, made his great humanitarian reputation by feeding the people of the war-stricken nations. He urged Federal appropriations for the relief of the starving Russians, and he appeared before a committee of Congress at that time and said, in part:

The problem that we are confronting is not a problem of general relief to Russia, for which there can be some criticism, but is a problem of relieving an area suffering from an acute drought. In other words, we are making a distinction here between the situation created by the hand of man as distinguished from the situation that might be called an act of God. This Volga area, as has been stated, is practically altogether an agricultural region . . .

He was then seeking an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to feed the people of a drought-stricken area in Russia; this was in 1921. In 1919 there was appropriated out of the public funds of the Treasury the sum of \$100,000,000 to feed starving Europeans, and again in 1921 a \$10,000,000 appropriation was approved to feed the hungry women and children of Germany. This money from our Treasury was placed at the disposal of Mr. Hoover, who was then a member of the Cabinet of that distinguished statesman and peerless leader, Woodrow Wilson. I might in passing call to the attention of the House that in 1914 Members representing Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States urged an appropriation of \$200,000 for purposes of relief for the people of the city of Salem, who, by reason of a devastating fire, were rendered homeless. In this connection, my colleagues, I wish to incorporate in this statement the message from the President of the United States to the Senate and the House of Representatives, which is as follows:

The Governor of Massachusetts has sent me the following telegram: "The Salem relief fund is increasing slowly. The expense of rehabilitation will be enormous, as 3,000 families are homeless and without work. If the National Government could appropriate \$200,000, it would assist greatly. I am informed that the action of the National Government at the time of the San Francisco disaster furnished a precedent. Can anything in the way of substantial contribution from the National Government be obtained?"

In view of the great number of homeless and destitute in Salem, I very earnestly urge the immediate appropriation by the Congress of \$200,000, as requested by the governor, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

WOODROW WILSON.

So you see, my colleagues, it has been a common practice of our Government to relieve distress wherever assistance was needed. I can see no distinction between an appropriation out of the public funds for food to feed Europeans and food for the mouths of the hungry in our own land.

By reason of the failure to provide adequate relief for the afflicted people of our country, the other branch of Congress (Senate) recently passed an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be administered by the American Red Cross, and in the event that the American Red Cross should decline to distribute the money appropriated then the President of the United States was authorized and empowered to immediately designate governmental agencies to distribute this sum, or any part of it which he deemed necessary to meet the exigencies in the present national emergency; this legislation received my support. I have confidence in the American Red Cross; I am confident that the President of the United States has sufficient ability to properly distribute the fund if he deemed it necessary for the relief of our people. I am convinced that it is the duty of our Government in times of great national emergency to join hand with the American Red Cross for the relief of the stricken and the afflicted of our Nation. It is unfortunate that some of the leaders in our political life should charge men sworn to a duty of honor with "playing politics with human misery."

Politics has not entered my mind during this serious controversy. The question as to whether or not the American Red Cross will handle any sum appropriated is immaterial. If any emergency exists and the Red Cross feels that it would be inadvisable for them to handle an appropriation, their position and attitude should be respected, irrespective of our personal opinions. The fundamental question is

whether or not such an emergency exists as to justify the Congress making an appropriation as contemplated. It is argued on all sides—the President, the Red Cross, and the Congress of the United States—that there exists a great national emergency. Red Cross officials declare that in Arkansas alone 31 per cent of the population is receiving aid, and the drought-stricken area includes either the whole or portions of 21 States.

It was stated some time ago "that the Red Cross had sufficient funds available to handle the situation, and that governmental assistance was not required"; the true conditions were concealed. To-day, only a few months later, it is admitted that conditions are more terrible than was pictured at that time by even those who urged the passage of an appropriation for loan purposes. The conditions were so bad that an appeal for \$10,000,000 was made to the people of the United States; it is now admitted that a great emergency exists.

The objectors to the appropriation of \$25,000,000 characterize this appropriation as a "dole" and that it is socialistic, meaning "state socialism"; I disagree with both arguments. To render assistance when an emergency exists is not a "dole," neither is it "state socialism." It is the response of humanity to the justifiable call for help, and the effort of the Government to assist its distressed people, performing a natural and proper duty. The assistance rendered is confined to the period of the emergency; it is not of a continuing nature. To render aid to a starving people facing disease as a result of malnutrition, is not "state socialism." It was not "state socialism" to appropriate money and to feed people in Europe, and it is not "state socialism" to appropriate money to feed the starving people of this Nation. It must be borne in mind that we are not considering an appropriation under ordinary and normal times; we are faced with a national emergency which necessitates action upon the part of the Government to relieve the existing distress.

The question is whether or not, when a national emergency exists, the Federal Government should appropriate money to relieve existing distress. That is a simple question to answer. So far as I am concerned, I will never have any hesitancy, so long as I am a Member of the Congress, to vote for appropriations to aid our people, starving and sick, when an emergency exists.

The refusal of the Red Cross to handle any amount appropriated is simply an incidental question. The question of an extra session is likewise incidental, injected into this issue to becloud and to take the public mind away from the fact that hundreds of thousands of people are faced with starvation; that scurvy, rickets, pelagra, and typhoid fever are now evident, following in the wake of undernourishment, and it is expected that these diseases will rapidly increase. The Federal Government should use every resource available to bring relief, not only to those affected but to prevent disease from following in the wake of the existing conditions; there is a possibility that it will not be confined to the drought-stricken area, but may spread to other parts of the country.

I have heard Members of this House in debate, characterize the Federal aid contemplated by this appropriation as constituting a dole. Federal aid under the circumstances that exist in the drought area in this country does not constitute a dole. The aid that is given by our Government is temporary; it is given to the afflicted people to tide them over this temporary period. The character of this aid is not only temporary in some instances as I have already stated, but is a loan.

In the past we have responded to the appeal of the people from many lands; to-day the appeal comes from our own people. The response to that cry for help should be answered with all the dispatch that is humanly possible on the part of our Government.

HOURLY OF MEETING TO-MORROW

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it was expected that the legislative appropriation bill would be considered this afternoon at the completion of the matter just under consideration.

But it is so late that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY], in charge of the bill, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN], have both requested that I ask that the House meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock so that general debate on that appropriation bill may be taken up.

I now make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that to-morrow is to be given over exclusively to general debate?

Mr. TILSON. I understand it will be given over exclusively to the consideration of this bill and that most of the day will be devoted to general debate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we are not going to have general debate on this bill during all of to-morrow, I am going to object.

Mr. TILSON. It is general debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman was curtailing general debate.

Mr. TILSON. If general debate is finished and it is desired to read a part of the bill that will be done, but general debate will go on until it is completed.

Mr. BLANTON. I only wanted to be sure that all Members who desired to speak would be given an opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. TARVER, for to-day, on account of illness.

Mr. STEVENSON, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. BARBOUR (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for to-day, on account of illness.

Mr. PARSONS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. LEECH, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 31, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 31, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

(10 a. m.)

Relating to wages of employees of contractors on Federal works. (H. R. 16619.)

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

To consider bills for the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the Federal highway act. (S. 5314.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

797. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Two Rivers Harbor, Wis. (H. Doc. No. 727); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

798. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Mobile River, Ala., authorized by the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930 (H. Doc. No. 728); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

799. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on examination and survey for flood protection at Hickman, Ky., made under the provisions of section 11 of the act of May 15, 1928 (H. Doc. No. 729); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

800. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Mount Desert Narrows between Western Bay and Eastern Bay, Me.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

801. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and certification to the Congress, pertaining to private act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. pt. 2, 2349), entitled "An act for the relief of Capt. William Cassidy"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SIMMONS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 16738. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. J. Res. 195. A joint resolution authorizing investigation of certain operations on cotton exchanges; without amendment (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2980. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to allow certain expenditures in the War Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 16159. A bill authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,000 to defray the expenses of the Pan American Commercial Conference, to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12169. A bill to amend the meaning and intention of an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health of the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2756. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 5715. An act to authorize the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games; without amendment (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9104. A bill to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Fort Necessity, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2444).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9224. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the completion of a sea wall at Selfridge Field, Mich.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 16215. A bill authorizing the sale of surplus power developed under the Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 15014. A bill donating bronze trophy cannon to the city of Morristown, Morris County, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. S. 181. An act for the relief of James H. Roache; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 401. An act for the relief of Claude J. Church; without amendment (Rept. No. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KINZER: Committee on Claims. S. 457. An act for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Braznell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. S. 1367. An act for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1671. An act for the relief of Stillwell Bros. (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 5321. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Myers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7796. A bill for the relief of Enza A. Zeller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15107. A bill for the relief of A. W. Kliefoth; with amendment (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 16744. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8490) for the relief of James M. Booth, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 16739) to amend the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16740) to authorize the issuance of a special series of bicolored postage stamps commemorative of the Tenth Olympiad to be held at Los Angeles, Calif., during the year 1932; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 16741) to amend the revenue act of 1928 in regard to unemployment-relief trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 16742) to relieve unemployment by providing for the building of check dams and other structures to prevent soil erosion, gullying, flood, and drought by retarding the run-off on watersheds and causing the waters to soak into the ground in order to replenish springs and wells and to restore subsoil moisture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROSS: A bill (H. R. 16743) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in agricultural commodities by regulating transactions on commodity exchanges, putting a stop to short selling thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16744) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 16745) to amend the perishable agricultural commodities act, 1930, so as to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of floricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16746) transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to the South Park Commissioners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 343) for the consideration of H. R. 14688, a bill to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 349) for the consideration of S. 4750, a bill to authorize the alteration and repairs to certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 350) for the consideration of S. 550, a bill to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 489) increasing the rates of duty for the period of one year on agricultural products and provisions which are prescribed by Schedule 7 of the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of legislation for the construction of a dam across the Red River near Denison, Tex.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the early passage of legislation for construction of a dam across the Red River near Denison, Tex.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 16747) granting an increase of pension to Emma Z. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16748) granting a pension to Clara Hoard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16749) for the relief of Miles Thomas Barrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 16750) granting a pension to Nettie L. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16751) granting an increase of pension to Blanche A. Sheldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16752) authorizing Susan Sanders Cook to submit claim against the United States to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 16753) granting a pension to Olivia Keitt Murph; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 16754) for the relief of Mary B. Manley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16755) granting an increase of pension to Alice L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16756) granting a pension to Alice C. Hensly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16757) granting an increase of pension to Carrie R. Mauck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16758) granting a pension to Minnie B. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16759) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Ralph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16760) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Harrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 16761) for the relief of the Sherburne Mercantile Co.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16762) for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Lawson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16763) for the relief of Joseph Mastine Keefe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 16764) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Klinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 16765) granting an increase of pension to Harriett Drowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16766) granting a pension to Onie Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16767) granting a pension to Mary J. Mayhew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 16768) for the relief of E. S. Delaplane, jr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16769) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Turney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 16770) granting an increase of pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16771) granting a pension to Reatha Reneau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16772) granting a pension to Asa J. Lutes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 16773) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16774) granting an increase of pension to Hulda Patch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8996. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884 providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8997. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by the Chelsea Post, No. 496, American Legion, New York, N. Y., favoring immediate action be taken amending the World War vet-

erans' act, giving pensions to widows and orphans, and service connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8998. By Mr. BRIGGS: Telegram from the adjutant of Argonne Post, No. 20, American Legion, Galveston, Tex., indorsing House bill 3493, the Patman bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8999. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Resolution adopted by the members of the Lundberg-Lee Post, No. 266, the American Legion, at Hartland, Minn., providing that the adjusted-compensation certificates be paid at their full face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9000. By Mr. CLAGUE: Resolutions of Colburn Post, No. 286, American Legion, Sanborn, and Herbert Holtke Post, No. 285, American Legion, Lake Wilson, Minn., urging payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9001. Also, resolution of Lorentz Post, No. 11, American Legion, Mankato, Minn., urging immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9002. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Smyrna, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9003. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Advertising Men's Post, No. 209, of the American Legion, State and county of New York, requesting the Congress to take immediate steps to allow the veterans to borrow one-half of the face value on all adjusted-service certificates, without invalidating the insurance status of the said policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9004. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Dr. D. Immel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House Resolution 311 calling on the Postmaster General for certain information with reference to filling vacancies of clerks and carriers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9005. By Mr. MAGRADY: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of House Joint Resolution 356; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9006. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, indorsing the Patman bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9007. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of the Victory Day Woman's Christian Temperance Union, meeting under the auspices of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gem, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9008. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of William Scott and other residents of Cheshire, Conn., urging passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9009. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3344) supplementing the national prohibition act for the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is debatable.